The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is—Town*, 26s.; *Country*, 28s.; *with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. *Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.*

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is equested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 13, 1875.

CURRENT TOPICS.

Mr. AUGUSTUS KEPPEL STEPHENSON has been appointed to the Solicitorship to the Treasury, vacant by the death of Mr. John Gray, Q.C. Mr. Stephenson was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1852, and has held the office of Assistant Solicitor to the Treasury since June, 1866. He was formerly a member of the Norfolk Circuit.

THE COMPULSION proposed in last year's Land Transfer Bill was not only open to the charge of being no real compulsion, but it did not extend to by far the greater part of the land in the kingdom—that, namely, which never comes into the market; it did not include the cases in which cheapness and facility of transfer are most essential—viz., sales for less than £300; it proposed to compel the adoption of a system as yet wholly untried, and to enforce registration of all the titles within its scope—estimated at about 150,000 titles a-year—in a single office at Lincoln's-inn. The omission of the clause from the re-introduced Land Transfer Bill is the best testimony to the weight of the reasons we have from the very first brought forward against the proposal, but it is certainly interesting to find the Lord Chancellor urging as arguments against compulsory registration some of the considerations to which the law officers last session so persistently turned a deaf ear. Thus he avowed his conviction that if compulsion is imposed "you cannot stop short of establishing *all over the country* district registries, because obviously it would be a great hardship for persons living in remote parts of the country, and who are anxious and willing to conduct a sale without coming to London, to have to come to London to register the sale." This appears to indicate an advance from the position maintained in his lordship's speech in introducing last year's Bill, when he urged that even if a registry were established in every county in England, people would often have to go as great a distance to the registry as if they had to come to London. Having got so far, it may be hoped that the Lord Chancellor may come to see that to render his measure a success it is essential that local registries should be established all over the country He proposes to decide upon the places where these institutions shall be provided by the extent to which owners of property within each district resort to registration in a London office. But, we would venture to ask, has he considered that if it is a "great hardship" for owners of property distant from London to be compelled to register in London it is not very likely that they will do so of their own accord? Surely you must provide facilities for registration before you can expect people to register. To say, "we will provide facilities if you show by coming to London that you can do without them," seems, if we may say so, somewhat absurd. In the case of registration as proprietor only, the process, with a registry at your doors, would be so comparatively simple and inexpensive that it might reasonably be expected to be extensively resorted to. Will that be the case if every transaction has to be conducted through a London office? The only ground alleged against the proposal to set up district registries throughout the country is that of the expense. But the answer to this is furnished by the Land Transfer Commissioners in the suggestion, to which we have often before drawn attention, that the local offices "might be set up on a very humble scale at first," and the functions of the district registrars be confined to such of the proceedings for absolute or limited title as experience might show to be unattended with serious difficulty; to registration as proprietor only, and to entries on the register subsequent to registration; an option being given to parties to resort to the London office.

Of the nature of the other alterations in the Bill the Lord Chancellor gave no explanation, but it is to be hoped that they may be found to embrace a provision requiring the sanction of the Attorney-General to any prosecution for the rather alarmingly indefinite misdemeanours proposed to be created under the heads of suppression of deeds or evidence, and statements in affidavits "false in any material particular."

IF THE ELECTORS OF TIPPERARY should bestow upon Mr. John Mitchell that which he describes as "the highest honour that can be awarded to mortal man"—the honour of being returned as their representative—the same questions are likely to be raised as were debated upon a previous election for the same county; but we imagine there can be no doubt as to the result. Mitchell, it will be remembered, was convicted in 1848 of treason-felony, and sentenced to fourteen years' penal servitude. *Attainder* for treason or felony is a very ancient disqualification for being returned to Parliament. "A man attainted of treason or felony," says Coke (4 Inst. 47), "is not eligible; for concerning the election of two knights, the words of the writ be *Duos milites gladiis cinctos magis idoneos et discretos eligi fac.*" Conviction under the Treason Felony Act (11 & 12 Vict. c. 12), however, does not involve attainder, and in the case of O'Donovan Rossa, who, after having been convicted and sentenced to penal servitude for life under that Act, was elected for Tipperary in 1870, it was contended that conviction for treason-felony did not disqualify for election to Parliament. But Mr. Gladstone drew attention to the fact that in Smith O'Brien's case, in 1849, the resolution of the House declaring his disqualification did not put it on the ground that he had been "attainted" of high treason, but that he had been "adjudged guilty" of that crime—a suggestion to substitute the former word having been rejected—and he argued that the crime, and not a mere technicality of the law, constituted the real disqualification. This view was supported by Sir Roundell Palmer, who pointed out that the term "attaint" was the technical equivalent of the word "convicted" in all cases of treason or felony under the former state of the law, and the House resolved "that Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, returned as a knight of the shire for the county of Tipperary, having been adjudged guilty of felony, and sentenced to penal servitude for life, and being now imprisoned under such sentence, has become, and continues, incapable of being elected or returned as a member of this House." The fact that O'Donovan Rossa was actually undergoing the sentence at the time of his return—to which some of our contemporaries appear to attach importance—is, of course, wholly immaterial if the ground of the disqualification is that stated by Coke, viz., that a person who has been convicted of felony cannot be one of the "discreet and fit persons" required by the writ to be returned. The writ, in fact, is not obeyed by the return of such a person.

Another question raised in the case of O'Donovan Rossa was whether, since the passing of the Election Petitions Act, 1868, the House has jurisdiction to decide on the disqualification of persons returned to serve in

Parliament. Section 50 of that Act enacts that "no election or return to Parliament shall be questioned except in accordance with the provisions of this Act," under which the trial of controverted elections in Ireland was transferred to the Court of Common Pleas at Dublin. It was contended that the effect of the section was to give to that court exclusive cognizance of questions relating to the disqualification of persons returned to serve in Parliament. But it was urged by the Solicitor-General, whose view has since been indorsed by Sir T. E. May (Parliamentary Practice, 649), that the section applies only to elections controverted in the sense of being questioned by petition; that it merely substitutes the Court of Common Pleas for the election committee, and does not take away the jurisdiction always exercised by the House of deciding upon the qualification of a member whose election has not been questioned by petition. This view was adopted and acted upon by the House, not only in O'Donovan Rossa's case, but also, in 1868, in that of Sir Sydney Waterlow, when, after the withdrawal before hearing, of a petition against his return, a Select Committee of the House was appointed to consider whether he was disqualified under statute 22 Geo. 3, c. 45; and the committee having reported that he was so disqualified, a new writ was ordered to be issued.

One of the reporters in the *Times* has recently called attention to the hardship occasioned to ordinary litigants by sensation cases. The sittings after term in Middlesex and London, at which alone special juries are taken, last about a fortnight each. A sensation case now often occupies a week, and sometimes a fortnight. At the present sittings in Middlesex after term the way has been blocked by the prospectus case in the Queen's Bench and a great libel case in the Exchequer. The result, no doubt, is a large number of *remanets* and considerable delay and expense to litigants. To remedy this evil it is suggested that arrangements ought to be made for holding second courts in which the special jury cases might proceed. To some extent this might perhaps be done, but the truth is that the block at the sittings in London and Middlesex is only one illustration of a difficulty, common to all legal matters, to which we have before had occasion to refer with regard to the arrangement of business at assizes. Every now and then exceptionally heavy matters will arise, and if the judicial machinery is adequate to dispose of them without any difficulty or prejudice to the ordinary business, it will be more than sufficient to deal with the usual amount of work, and the public will grumble at the waste of power involved It is obviously impossible to provide that the machinery shall always be exactly proportioned to the calls made upon it. Our belief is that the present judicial staff of England is under rather than over supplied, and that the judges have more than enough to do when the business is of average amount. The consequence is that when an unusual pressure arises arrears must accumulate. To a very considerable extent this leads to actions being settled otherwise than by trial in court, as by amicable compromises and references. The evil thus cures itself in some degree, but in so far only as the block of business is concerned, for until the crowded state of the lists is abated the interests of litigants undoubtedly suffer. The re-arrangement of business under the Judicature Act may introduce some improvement; but we do not see how, with the present staff of judges and accommodation for courts, it is possible altogether to ensure against the evils we are discussing. If the time of the judges is already fully taken up no re-arrangement of business can make much difference. It may be suggested that the proper expedient would be to economize judicial power by having questions of law decided in the first instance by one judge. We have on previous occasions expressed a strong opinion against this course. There may be some truth in the notion that a court in banc is not much better than the strongest member of it sitting alone would be; but the answer is, that though the strongest member of it sitting alone might be a very satisfactory tribunal, the weakest might be a very unsatisfactory one. If the equity system of single judges works well, it may be accounted for by the fact that the work can be done by only four judges of first instance who represent (or ought to represent) the very pick of the equity bar. It would be very different, we take it, if the state of the business required *eighteen* vice-chancellors.

The case of *Lacey* v. *Hill*, reported in this week's issue of the *Weekly Reporter*, contains the decision of the Master of the Rolls on two questions of considerable importance to conveyancers. The first question is whether a general devise of real estate is sufficient, in the case of a testator married since the 1st of January, 1834, to defeat his widow's right to dower under section 4 of the Dower Act. That it is would seem almost too clear for argument, had it not been for a *dictum* of Lord Romilly in *Rowland* v. *Cuthbertson* (17 W. R. 907, L. R. 8 Eq. 466), where in the case of a general devise, he said that "he was not sure that section 4 is conclusive in this case, because, in order to dispose of the land, the testator must point it out specifically, or designate it in some way." Since this *dictum*, it has been the practice of some conveyancers to revert to the old, and on general grounds objectionable, practice of making purchasers declare against their widows in conveyances, and this course has, we believe, on account of the *dictum*, been advocated by no less an authority than Mr. Dart, in the last edition of his valuable work, although we are unable at present to lay our hand on the passage. In *Lacey* v. *Hill* Sir George Jessel very sensibly, as it appears to us, treats his predecessor's view as utterly untenable.

The other point decided in the recent case is that under the 3rd section of the Wills Act, which enables copyholders to dispose of their estates, "notwithstanding that the testator may not have surrendered the same to the use of his will," a devise of copyholds not so surrendered operates against the claim to freebench in precisely the same manner as if they had been surrendered. This is against the opinion of Scriven and his learned editor (see the Treatise on Copyholds, 5th edition, p. 57, and note 101), but is surely in accordance with sound sense.

It would be desirable that some further explanation should be sought from the First Commissioner of Works with reference to the subject of the provision in the new law courts for the Court of Appeal. In answer to a question by Mr. Freshfield on Tuesday, Lord H. Lennox said that as Mr. Street's plans for the new Courts of Justice had been "approved before there was any idea of making a change in the Judicature, no special apartment for the Supreme Appeal Court has, by that name, been included in the new buildings; but, by the courtesy of the Society of Lincoln's-inn, their old dining-hall has been made over to the Government. It has been suitably fitted by the Office of Works, and restored to its previous dimensions, and is now, I am informed, admirably adapted to be the Court of Appeal." Does this mean that the idea of concentrating the courts in the new building has been abandoned, and that the most important of all the courts is to be permanently located elsewhere? We do not know what may be the Government standard of a building "admirably adapted to be a court of appeal," but, even in its state of fresh paint and abundant red cloth, the room at Lincoln's-inn can hardly be thought by any one a fit chamber for the highest court in the realm.

The news of the appointment of Mr. Garth, Q.C., to the office of Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature at Calcutta, has created considerable surprise. The

holder of this office is called upon to adjudicate on the concerns of a vast mercantile community, on rules and usages of widely different races and on important questions of State. These duties seem to require a large experience, an intimate knowledge of commercial law, a grasp of general principles, and great flexibility of mind. We cannot expect this ideal to be fulfilled in every case, but there are degrees of fitness, and the reverse. Notwithstanding Mr. Garth's well-deserved popularity, we doubt whether his best friend could honestly say that his degree of fitness is a high one, and we cannot but regard the appointment as due rather to political or personal friendship than to any regard for the qualifications required for the office.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT we made last week that the rules contained in the schedule to the Judicature Act and the proposed rules framed last year are to be consolidated and presented to the profession in a compact form, was confirmed by the Lord Chancellor in his speech on introducing the Judicature Act Amendment Bill on Tuesday. There are points on which the two sets of rules are not harmonious, and there are other points (many of them indicated by an able correspondent in our columns last October) on which the proposed rules need amendment. It cannot be doubted that advantage will be taken of the consolidation of the rules to introduce alterations in these respects, and we may reasonably hope to have at last a very complete and intelligible code of practice.

THE IRISH BAR IN ARMS.

THE meeting of the Irish bar which we reported last week is important, as the deliberate utterance, on a subject directly affecting themselves, of a body of gentlemen of great learning and experience. The unanimous opinion, however arrived at, of the Irish bar must always be an element of very great weight in the consideration of any proposal affecting in any manner the administration of justice in Ireland. It must not be overlooked, however, that the opinions of the bar upon the questions discussed at the late meeting were declared as long ago as March last, and have been prominently brought to the notice of the Government and the public through more than one channel. Looked upon, therefore, as an expression of the opinion of the bar, the resolutions adopted at the late meeting tell us nothing except that they still adhere to the views originally expressed by them, and, we presume, for the same reasons. For it is to be remarked that, neither in the resolutions themselves nor in the speeches of the very learned and distinguished gentlemen who proposed and supported them, do we find any "reason for the faith that is in them," or any attempt to displace the grounds upon which the Legislature, after many years' deliberation, upon the recommendation of the Judicature Commissioners, and with the concurrence of the highest legal authorities on both sides of the House, determined to remodel our judicial system, and put it upon a basis which will be, at any rate, more logical and philosophical than anything we could hitherto boast of. If the Irish bar had frankly accepted the principle of the legislation of 1873, and, acknowledging that it is now too late to reverse this principle, had limited their efforts to protests against objectionable details, accompanied by practical suggestions for the guidance of the Government in preparing, or of Parliament in amending, the measures necessary for completing the new arrangements, they might have rendered valuable service to the country, and would, at any rate, have been sure of a respectful and attentive hearing; but passionate declamation in favour of the retention of the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords, or against the fusion of the courts of common law and equity, is likely to have about the same practical effect as an essay in favour of the restoration of the Heptarchy. It is of paramount importance, upon the admission of the Irish bar themselves, if that were requisite, that there should be one Court of Ultimate Appeal, and but one, for the whole of the United Kingdom, and therefore the House of Lords cannot be retained as the ultimate court of appeal for Ireland or Scotland unless it be restored for England also; and no one who knows anything of the course of legislation on this subject, or who has attempted to follow the phases of this question from the report of the Committee of Privileges on Life Peerages (in Lord Wensleydale's case) in 1857 down to the debates upon Lord Selborne's Act in 1873, can look upon any attempt to reverse the policy of that Act as other than Quixotic. From the moment that the Committee proposed to give increased efficiency to the House by the appointment of paid assessors, the transfer of the jurisdiction to a tribunal which should be a purely judicial body, in name as well as in fact, became a mere question of time. What the constitution of the new court ought to be is a question of the highest importance, upon which no final utterance has yet been pronounced, and we cannot but regret that the Irish bar did not apply themselves to this question, upon which their deliberate opinion would have been entitled to the greatest weight, rather than waste their energies by beating the air in opposition to a foregone conclusion, arrived at by the country after an investigation extending over more than fifteen years, in the course of which six different propositions, more or less intended to prop the waning jurisdiction of the House, were successively proposed and negatived; the result of each successive discussion being to show with increasing clearness that purely judicial functions ought to be exercised by a purely judicial body.

The other question dealt with by the Irish bar stands in nearly the same position. That the scheme of the Irish judiciary must be altered, and brought into harmony with the new system established in England by the Act of 1873, is practically admitted, and we may, therefore, dismiss the panegyric pronounced upon the existing courts, however well merited, as irrelevant. But in what manner this can best be done; into how many divisions, of how many judges respectively, the new court should be divided; how many circuits should be retained; whether the absurd jumble of functions perpetrated in England by the transfer of the bankruptcy business to the Exchequer Division forms an example to be followed or avoided in Ireland; these and similar questions, on which we could earnestly desire to hear the views of the Irish bar, are all but ignored by the meeting, while we are met by a passionate outburst of indignation against any alteration whatever in "the ancient number" of the common law judges, a number which, so far as Ireland is concerned, is not yet quite a century old. On this point we desire to say a few words hereafter: for the present it may suffice to remark that the comparisons with the bench in England, of which so much has been made, are illogical and delusive; and that, if they prove anything at all, they point rather to an increase of judicial strength here than any material decrease of judges in Ireland. But upon this point the Irish bar have not condescended to give us any assistance; for we can draw nothing from a simple protest against change, unaccompanied by a single practical suggestion, embellished, indeed, by much magnificent declamation, but unsupported by any array of facts, statistical or otherwise.

On Saturday morning Mr. Justice Field was sworn in before the Lord Chancellor as one of the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, having previously been made a serjeant-at-law. Mr. Justice Archibald also took the oaths on being transferred from the Court of Queen's Bench to the Court of Common Pleas, in the place of the Right Hon. Sir H. S. Keating, resigned.

RECENT DECISIONS ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW.

The last two numbers of the series of these reports * contain less of interest than some earlier numbers which we noticed last year.

(1) In bankruptcy we have (p. 246) the full report of the judgment (which we have already noticed, 18 S. J. 928) deciding that a Prussian creditor is not bound by the bankruptcy of his Hamburg debtor under which he has never proved; but, on the statement of facts now given, we are struck with the singular fact that the unsatisfied creditor was allowed to appropriate to his own use a bill forwarded to him for a specific purpose, a right which would certainly not have been conceded to him here, though, on the main question, the decision would have been the same. In the same sense it was held in another case from the Imperial Court at Leipsic (p. 250) that the German debtor of an English bankrupt was entitled to set off against a trustee suing in Germany a claim for breach of contract, although by English law, as it then stood, the claim could not, under the circumstances, have been proved in the bankruptcy.

Under the same head, in the *Dict. de Jur. Française*, p. 239 (tit. *Faillite*), we also observe a case in which it was held that when a Frenchman is adjudicated bankrupt abroad, the representative of the estate cannot sue in that character in France without having obtained an *exequatur* from the French courts, and that, notwithstanding that the bankruptcy takes place in a country the judgments of whose tribunals are, by treaty, to be executory in France *sans revision*. This agrees with the principle which, as we observed in a former number (18 S. J. 928), seems admitted by some foreign authorities, that a man can only be adjudged bankrupt by the tribunals of his own country; but we observe, from a note appended to this decision, that the point is not a settled one in France, and that both earlier and later decisions have recognized the position of the representative of the foreign bankruptcy under similar circumstances (compare 18 S. J. 928, as to the Prussian rule).

(2) The jurisdiction of courts in respect of immoveables situated abroad is illustrated by two cases, one from Spain (p. 253), the other from Mexico (p. 256). In the former, a contract made in Danish territory with respect to land situated in the Spanish island of Vicques, which had been established in a litigation carried through the Danish courts to the ultimate court of appeal, not, however, without the defendant's raising the plea of want of jurisdiction, was declared void by the court at Madrid, the foreign judgment being disregarded on the ground that the subject-matter of the contract was in Spanish territory—certainly a very strong application of the *lex loci rei sitæ*. In the latter case, the Mexican court, on the same ground, refused to give effect to a decree of the court at Seville in a cause of succession, directing the sale of real property situated in Mexico (compare the case of *Paget* v. *Ede*, 22 W. R. 625, L. R. 18 Eq. 118, commented on 18 S. J. 967).

(3) On the subject of suits against foreigners, a decision of the Court of Appeal at Brussels illustrates anew the rule of Belgian law, which like that of France, refuses to administer justice between foreigners (see 18 S. J. 625). It appears, however, from the report that it has been proposed to except from this rule the case of a foreign defendant to a suit by a native seeking to bring before the tribunal, by the *action en guarantie*, another foreigner from whom he claims indemnity; and an editorial note states that this is already the rule in France, where the *action en guarantie* is so far dependent on the original action as to establish a case of *connexité*. In Italy, as appears from a case at p. 336, a more liberal rule prevails in this as in other similar matters; but the courts nevertheless refuse to entertain questions of *status* between foreigners, and will not, therefore, pronounce against a foreigner an *interdictio bonorum* on the ground of imbecility, though they will make such provisional order as the necessity of the case may require, and will accordingly appoint a guardian *ad interim*.

(4) On the subject of foreign judgments, it has been held by the court at Nancy (*Dict. de Jur. Fr.* tit. *Jugement Etranger*), that an *exequatur* cannot be obtained for a foreign judgment without citing the person against whom it is to be put in force, notwithstanding that, by treaty, the *merite extinseque* only of the judgment, not its substantial merits, is to be examined. From the expressions used in the short summary of this case it is not clear whether the same would be held in a case when by treaty the *exequatur* was to be granted *sans revision*, but we should suppose those words also to import no more than that the substance of the foreign judgment only, as distinguished from the essentials of jurisdiction, was not to be reviewed. It will be borne in mind that, in the absence of such a treaty (for the mode of applying such a treaty see an instance at p. 306), the French courts (founding themselves on the *Code de Proc.*, art. 546, and the *Code Civ.*, art. 2123, 2128; though the reasoning is far from convincing) do not, like the English courts, give effect to a foreign judgment upon being satisfied that the parties were duly before a court of competent jurisdiction, but insist on examining afresh the merits of the case, and even hold, as in the case cited, that a Frenchman cannot renounce the privilege of having his case thus re-heard in the tribunals of his own country. For the more liberal procedure in Italy by the *Giudizio di Delibazione*, see 18 S. J. 927.

(5) As to marriage, a case is reported in the *Dict. de Jur. Fr.* (tit. *Mariage*), which seems to settle a question that has been much discussed, and on which opinions have been divided. The question was whether the marriage of a Frenchman abroad with a foreigner was invalidated by the absence of the *actes respectueux*, prescribed by arts. 151—153 of the *Code Civil*, or of the *actes de l'état civil* prescribed by art. 63. As to the first, it seems to be the received opinion that even as between French subjects intermarrying in France, the omission of these formalities does not make the marriage invalid (Sirey, note to art. 157; Demolombe, *Mariage*, vol. 1, p. 117). But as to the second, which art. 170 at first sight, by expressly mentioning them, seems to require in the case of French subjects marrying abroad, there appears to have been great controversy whether their omission *per se* invalidated the marriage, or whether it only did so in cases where the parties acted in fraud of the law; a discussion which is conducted with much tedious rhetoric by Demolombe (*Mariage*, vol. 1), and summed up by him (at p. 329) in two bewildering propositions. The court at Paris appears (if we rightly understand the short summary given) to have decided in favour of the second view, and held good a marriage contracted abroad (without fraud) by a Frenchman with a foreigner, notwithstanding the omission of the *actes respectueux* and the *publications préalables*, thus affirming the opinion expressed by M. Fœlix (*Droit Int. Privé*, vol. 2, pp. 366—376). It will be remembered that in our own law the omission of formalities prescribed by 4 Geo. 4, c. 76, s. 22, has been constantly held to invalidate a marriage only where both parties have known of the illegality (see 16 S. J. 769, 17 S. J. 164). We should have been glad to see this decision reported more fully.

(6) In the cognate subject of guardianship, a decision has been pronounced in the *Cour de Cassation* which seems open to some doubt. A Frenchwoman having married an Austrian, afterwards, by her husband's death regained her French nationality (*Code Civ.* art. 19). The children, however, remained Austrian. The question was who had the right of guardianship, the mother, who would according to French law have it, or the paternal grandfather, who would have it according to the Austrian law? The court decided in favour of the law of the

* *Journal de Droit International Privé.* Paris.

mother and against the law of the father and infants, on grounds which are not very intelligible, but which seem based on "principles of sovereignty." There can be little doubt that in Austria a different conclusion would have been arrived at. Does it then depend on the law of the place where the infants are found? If so, it would be immaterial what was the nationality of the parent. But if not, it is not easy to see what "principles of sovereignty" have to do with the matter. Whatever right existed was derived out of the marriage, and it would seem reasonable to say that it must follow the law which governed the marriage relations while they subsisted, that is the law of Austria. Suppose the question had arisen in any third country, neither France nor Austria, would not that have been the decision? And ought it to be different because it arises in France?

(7) In Hungary a question has arisen which is worthy of notice as illustrating the law of evidence in merchants' accounts which prevails in several foreign States. By the French *Code de Com.* (arts. 8—17) minute regulations are made as to the books which are to be kept by traders, and in actions between traders books regularly kept are admissible in evidence. The *Handelsgesetzbuch* (arts. 28—40) contains similar provisions, but allows to the books less evidentiary force, requiring them to be supplemented by other circumstances, or by an oath, whether a mere oath of verification or of a more detailed kind we do not know. It appears that similar provisions exist in the Austrian code, and that by the same code a creditor, on producing a verified extract from his trade-books regularly kept, is entitled to have inscribed on the Land-books a *Vormerkung*. This gives him a kind of charge upon his debtor's land, which, after the lapse of a prescribed period, ripens into a complete hypothecary right. This privilege, however, is only accorded to duly registered firms. In the case in question a foreign creditor sought to obtain, on the production of an extract from his books, the inscription of a *Vormerkung* against his Hungarian debtor; but, in the absence of evidence that his firm was duly registered according to the law of his domicile, the Royal Court of Appeal for Hungary, affirming the decision of the Court at Pesth, rejected his demand. It may be observed that, as no register of trading firms exists here, it would seem impossible for an English creditor to use this privilege, and even if such a register existed (according to the scheme of a Bill introduced into the House of Commons last session) it might be a question whether, in the absence of any provisions as to book-keeping, the privilege would be allowed in countries where books are made evidence subject to strict regulations as to the manner in which they are kept.

(8) We noticed (18 S. J. 945) a decision in Holland as to the law of prescription applicable to contracts. In the present number a case is reported from Russia (at p. 333) in which it has been held that the law applicable is that of the country where the obligation is contracted. For the reasons we stated on the former occasion, we do not see how this question is capable of receiving the general answer which jurists seek to give it, and their diversity of opinion itself affords a strong reason for believing that this is true.

(9) From Switzerland we have a vague and unsatisfactory case which does not properly involve any conflict of law, or application of foreign law, and is of international interest only as it may affect the rights of foreign merchants. The result of the case seems to be that the Swiss buyer of goods from a foreign merchant, who rejects the goods delivered to him on the ground of their inferior quality or bad condition, becomes the bailee of the seller, and must neglect or delay "no measure of a nature to settle equitably the difference between them." The first part of this statement is clear, and such as would hardly be disputed; an English court would probably say that he was an *involuntary bailee*. But the end of the sentence throws on the buyer a most embarrassing burden. That he should be bound to take reasonable care of the goods is an intelligible proposition; but why should he be bound, or how can he be reasonably expected, to take such steps as the seller or as a tribunal would consider fit to be taken on the seller's part, for the purpose of settling the difference between them? Amongst the measures which the tribunal thinks ought certainly to be taken, is the placing of the goods in the hands of third persons. Such a step might be most injurious to the interest whether of the seller or of the buyer; yet, on pain of losing his right of rejection, the buyer is to be compelled to do this, to the loss of the seller if he is right, and to his own loss if he is wrong. Surely such a matter ought to be left to be determined by circumstances, and the only obligation stated as a matter of law should be that we have mentioned above, the obligation to take reasonable care?

There is also a summary of American decisions. In none of them do we find anything belonging to international law; but several are of interest in their bearing on English law, among which we would draw attention to the cases (with the editor's annotations) under the heads of *Assurance sur la vie* (as to insurable interest), *Hypotheque*, and *Immeubles par destination* (as to fixtures), *Ordre public* [No. 2] (as to a corrupt bargain to deceive the Legislature), *Telegramme* (as to the effect of conditions by a company against liability for delay or miscarriage of a telegraphic message), and *Transport* [No. 2] (which seems to be a decision on carrier's liability in accordance with *Liver Alkali Company* v. *Johnson* (L. R. 7 Ex. 267, 338).

THE COURTS OF QUARTER SESSIONS IN IRELAND.

The Judicature Bill for Ireland will, it may be assumed, soon become law; and in a few months a great change will pass over the superior courts in that country, and largely alter their nature and working. It seems hardly to admit of doubt that this reform ought to be supplemented by a remodelling, to a considerable extent, of the inferior courts of the sister country; and Parliament, we hope, will not lose the present opportunity to effect that object. The importance of these tribunals—called in Ireland the Courts of the Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, and corresponding in a great measure, but with marked distinctions, to our county courts—is well known to the Irish public, and has been appreciated by the profession here since the discussion on Mr. Gladstone's Land Act. The quarter sessions courts already engross the largest share, by many degrees, of the judicial business that is done in Ireland; they have an ample cognizance of crime and of civil rights; and the tendency to increase their duties has been such that probably they will become in a short time the principal, if not the most famous, centres for the administration of Irish justice. Yet every one knows, who has studied the subject, that there is large room for reform in them; nay, that the amending hand must be applied to them in a comprehensive and earnest way if they are to fulfil their proper mission, and supply the wants of the Irish community. If their jurisdiction is even now important, and has been greatly extended of late, it is still subject to harsh restrictions and fenced round by strict limitations, detrimental to justice and suitors' interests; and the result is that they are still unable to perform what should be their true functions throughout a wide range of legal questions which ought legitimately to belong to them. Their powers, too, are in many respects deficient, even as regards matters within their sphere; and their practice and procedure, though in the main excellent, is costly and cumbrous in some particulars. As for the organization of their judges and officers, it requires a very considerable change; and here, happily, it is possible to reconcile increased efficiency with judicious retrenchment, to make a judicial system better, and to lessen a charge on the national treasury. We

propose in this and a succeeding article to examine the jurisdiction, the state, and the existing constitution of these courts; to point out what we think their defects, and to indicate generally on what principles they ought to be reformed and improved.

The chairmen of quarter sessions in Ireland have a criminal as well as a civil jurisdiction; and this forms the distinctive difference between them and our county court judges, and makes their office one of greater importance. In criminal business the Irish chairmen sit as the chiefs of the associate justices; and as regards offences, their courts possess the powers of quarter sessions at common law, there being no statutes in Ireland like those which limit the sphere of our quarter sessions. In theory, therefore, the Irish courts have cognizance of very serious crimes, and burglaries, forgeries, and even perjuries are tried before them in many instances; but, as a general rule, the Attorney-General, who in Ireland is a minister of justice, directs felonies of the graver kinds to be sent for trial to the assizes. On the civil side, where the chairman sits by statute, and is the sole judge, these tribunals are called the Civil Bill Courts; and here, within the province of Law, as contra-distinguished from that of Equity, they have an ample and rapidly-growing jurisdiction. In all cases of contract and tort, except crim. con., breach of promise, libel, and slander, they can decide claims up to £40; and in ordinary actions between landlord and tenant, including ejectments of the usual kinds, their powers extend to £100. This range of jurisdiction has proved sufficient to bring into the Civil Bill Courts the great mass of the litigation of Ireland; and consisting, as it does in a great measure, of differences between landlords and tenants, the wide limit of £100, fixed by the Legislature in these cases, attests the importance of the chairman's duties. We have not, however, yet nearly marked the boundaries of the Civil Bill Courts' territory. In the case of claims under certain statutes, and even of ejectments of one class, they can try demands of any amount; they can determine several questions of title, their powers being, in this particular, much greater than those of our county courts; and they can decide, under a recent statute, causes sent to them from the superior courts, and from the Courts of Probate and Bankruptcy. These heads of jurisdiction are, however, trifling, and sink into mere insignificance compared with the responsible duties imposed on the judges of the Civil Bill Courts by the famous Land Act of 1870. As regards the new and complicated rights created by this great agrarian law, the Civil Bill Courts, as courts of first instance, have the sole and exclusive cognizance of them; and they try claims for the "disturbance" of tenants, and for compensation in respect of improvements, and counter-claims on the part of landlords, irrespective of the amount of the sums in dispute or the value of the estate or the tenancy. In these cases many thousands of pounds are not unfrequently brought into question. They involve inquiries of extreme nicety, requiring at once professional skill, agricultural knowledge, discernment, and patience; and the responsibilities attaching to them, as regards the chairmen, are serious and weighty. They are, in fact, most important suits of a very intricate and peculiar kind; and certainly the county courts of this country have no jurisdiction of equal gravity.

The Courts of Quarter Sessions in Ireland, therefore, have a large though a somewhat unequal authority in the domain of Law, whether common or statute. In the sphere of Equity, however, they are almost powerless—differing in this widely from our county courts, which, under the Act of 1865, have a very ample equity jurisdiction—annuities and legacies to a small amount being the only subjects which they can deal with. This defect is grievous in a high degree; it is aggravated by the fact that, since the enactment of the Irish Chancery Act of 1867, the expense of equity suits in Ireland has been often greatly increased, and it is a source of very general hardship. In truth, that the Irish Civil Bill Courts can hardly consider equitable rights is injurious to the entire community; and, as regards the lower and lower middle classes, it often amounts to a negation of justice, and an encouragement to violence, fraud, and wrong. Of the 400,000 or 500,000 farmers in Ireland, nearly all, since the Land Act of 1870, have a valuable interest in their holdings, and they all possess more or less personalty. Is it not monstrous that no cheap tribunals exist to administer this vast property in the numerous instances when it becomes assets, and that it must be either subjected to the Court of Chancery, or left wholly without protection, in the frequent case of disputes about it? Again, claims of specific performance, especially in the relation of landlord and tenant, are of very common occurrence in Ireland. Is it not iniquitous that a humble occupier who obtains a *bonâ fide* promise of a lease should be without the means of enforcing his right in a speedy and inexpensive way, and must either forego it, or have recourse to a remedy which may to him be ruin? Moreover, thousands of instances exist in Ireland of partnerships, not of great extent; of trusts collectively involving enormous sums, but comparatively small in each individual case; of mortgages, liens, and usurious contracts, in which the less wealthy classes are largely interested; and it is simply scandalous that this great mass of rights is not under suitable legal guardianship, and can be only regulated by a central tribunal the costliness of which is but too notorious. Nor is it only the poorer orders who suffer from this want of equitable powers; the rich, too, have sometimes cause to regret it. It would be a matter of very great importance that the Irish gentry should possess the means of obtaining injunctions at little expense in the case of cutting turf and injuring timber, wrongs to which they are very largely exposed; and they are often compelled to put up with injustice because redress is only to be had in Chancery. In numberless cases, too, of fraud, of trust, of mortgage, of specific performance, it is a misfortune, even to the upper classes, that the Civil Bill Courts are not equity courts; and were they to become so, the advantage to these orders would be not trifling.

The procedure and practice at the Irish quarter sessions are highly commendable in some respects. On the criminal side of the court the pleadings are by indictment in the ordinary form, and the trials resemble those at assizes. On the civil side a litigant states his cause of action in a civil bill process—a simple and untechnical document; and there are no defences by written pleas, all defences being made at the hearing. This informal system has proved satisfactory, and has stood well the true test, experience. Appeals from the orders of the Civil Bill Courts run to the assizes, and are in the nature of complete rehearings. This practice has also worked well, except, possibly, in land cases, where the appeal has been thought too summary. It may be added that in criminal cases the mode of trial is always by jury; in civil causes the chairman is usually sole judge, but a jury is permitted in some instances. On the whole this procedure and practice is good, but there is one serious defect in the system. There is no machinery in the Civil Bill Court for entering up judgment in default of appearance; and a suitor must prove his right in undefended cases. This entails great and unnecessary expense, which it would be desirable, and easy too, to avoid.

We now come to the judicial organization and official staff of the Irish quarter sessions. The chairmen are not less than thirty-three in number, there being one for each of thirty-one counties, and two for the great county of Cork, and they are divided into three classes, according to the extent of their counties, with salaries from £800 to £1,400 a year, but without allowances for the charge of travelling. The average duration of a chairman's business, in each year, is about as follows:—From sixty to seventy-five days for the chairmen of the first class, from thirty to forty for those of the second, and from, twenty to thirty for those of the third; and certainly

these periods are very short compared with those of our county court judges, whose working time, it appears, ranges between ninety and nearly two hundred days. The chairmen, as a body, are able judges, and stand very high in public esteem; but they are not judges and nothing else. They can practise at the bar, a licence withdrawn from our county court judges a long time ago; and thus they combine in their own persons the incongruous functions of judge and advocate. All this obviously requires amendment.

As regards the staff of the Quarter Sessions Courts there is room for even greater improvement. The principal, and indeed the only, official to be here noticed is the clerk of the peace; and it is not too much to say that his duties are large, and that his office is frequently very ill filled. The business of this officer is to act, in all respects, as the registrar of the court: he has to consider and frame indictments, to keep the records, and to make up orders; and much of the money of the suitors passes through his hands. Yet he is not appointed by the Crown or the chairman; he is usually very badly paid; and his office is sometimes improperly jobbed. Some of the clerks of the peace do their work admirably; but not a few are absentee gentlemen whose important duties are performed by deputies, in most cases, at a wretched salary.

Counsel often appear at the Irish quarter sessions; but the practitioners, as a rule, are local solicitors. These are, for the most part, able and honourable men; and the business is almost always well done. But the fees allowed in the courts are very much too low, and this has done harm in various ways.

In a succeeding article we shall briefly consider how all these shortcomings may be set right, and shall indicate the principles of reform applicable to the tribunals we have had under review.

Reviews.

THE CIVIL LAWS OF FRANCE.

THE CIVIL LAWS OF FRANCE TO THE PRESENT TIME. By DAVID MITCHEL AIRD, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1875.

We hardly know for what class of readers the present work is intended. It is in substance a kind of popularized version of the *Code Civil*. But this is a subject in which the general public can hardly be expected to take much interest, or from the study of which they are likely to derive much profit. It cannot be intended for the practitioner, for he could not be materially assisted by a work which does not carry any authority with it, and which contains no references, except the general enumeration at the head of each division of the articles of the Code which treat of the subject (thus—"Of Marriage, Code Napoleon, articles 144—226"). If he can consult the Code himself he will prefer to do so; if he cannot, he will hardly venture to draw his information from a source not more authentically vouched. The professed jurist will still less rely on or need its assistance. From some remarks in the preface we rather gather that students form the public to whom the author addresses himself, and for their benefit he says he has "appended explanatory notes which show the analogy that exists between the laws of France and the leading principles of the Roman law." These notes, however, are most meagre, and by no means answer to this description; it would be long before the inquisitive student would discover in them the leading principles of the Roman law, nor will he be much instructed by reading such notes as the following on marriage:—"Marriage is a civil institution, entered into by two persons willing and able to contract, and not labouring under any legal disability. Each party must exercise free will; for it is the consent, and not *the mere union*, of the parties that constitutes the marriage." Few languages are easier to acquire than French; perhaps none is so easy; and in the present case it would probably be better "*petere fontes quam sectari rivulos;*" but if the author can find a public large enough to recompense his pains, we shall be glad that his labour has not been spent in vain.

ALBERICUS GENTILIS.

AN INAUGURAL LECTURE ON ALBERICUS GENTILIS. Delivered at All Souls' College, Nov. 1, 1874, by THOMAS ERSKINE HOLLAND, B.C.L., Barrister-at-Law, Chichele Professor of International Law and Diplomacy at the University of Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co., 1874.

We are indebted to Mr. Holland for a very interesting memoir of a man who, as he observes, "has some claim to dispute with Grotius himself the title of the father of international law," but whose fame has been too much eclipsed by that of his greater successor. The author has gathered together with great care and diligence whatever can be discovered of the parentage, life, and works of Albericus Gentilis; and has given a living image of one who has hitherto been, to most of us, little but a name. We commend this pamphlet to the notice, not only of those who are concerned, as lawyers and jurists, with the science which Gentilis did so much to advance, but of all who are interested in the social and literary history of the times when Gentilis fled with his father from persecution in Italy, and afterwards flourished as Regius Professor at Oxford, and in the political events in which he bore a not inconsiderable part. They will find the lecture full of matter which bears the marks of most careful study, and which is presented to the reader in a clear and pleasing style; nor must we omit to add that an appendix contains a valuable list of the works of Gentilis, including his lost manuscripts, and some other unpublished writings.

Notes.

YESTERDAY THE LORDS JUSTICES affirmed the decision of Mr. Registrar Spring-Rice in *Re Sir W. Russell* (*ante*, p. 199), though upon a different ground. The point decided by the registrar was, that even though a liquidating debtor has obtained an order of discharge, yet, if the close of the liquidation has not been fixed, all his after acquired property vests in the trustee, and he cannot file a second petition, or if he does so, any resolutions passed under it will be invalid. The Lords Justices held that, upon the true construction of the resolutions passed in the first liquidation in the particular case, the future property of the debtor was entirely freed from the claims of the creditors, in consideration of an immediate payment made to the trustee, and a covenant to pay a further sum by instalments. But the ground upon which they affirmed the registrar's decision was that the debtor's statement filed with the second petition showed that he had practically no assets, except his halfpay as an officer in the army, and the resolutions passed under this petition gave him his discharge, and freed his halfpay altogether from the claims of the creditors. The court held that such resolutions could not have been passed by the creditors *bonâ fide* for the purpose of making the best possible arrangement in the interest of the creditors, but solely from motives of kindness to the debtor. Resolutions passed from such motives could not bind the dissentient minority of creditors, and could not be registered. This is in accordance with many decisions with regard to deeds under the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, such as *Ex parte Cowen* (15 W. R. 859, L. R. 2 Ch. 563), but it is, we believe, the first case in which the principle has been applied to arrangements under sections 125 and 126 of the Act of 1869. It should be added that the view taken by Mr. Registrar Spring-Rice as to the effect of an order of discharge granted before the formal close of a bankruptcy or liquidation has been adopted by Vice-

Chancellor Bacon in *Re Bennett's Trusts* (23 W. R. 229). We understand, however, that an appeal is to be presented from that decision.

On Monday last, at the Court of Bankruptcy, Mr. Registrar Hazlitt, sitting as Chief Judge, delivered judgment upon an application (*Re Pearson*) to review the taxation of receivers' bills of costs. The facts of the case were that on August 7, 1873, Pearson presented a petition for liquidation. On the 14th a receiver, Mr. Clarke, was appointed under this petition. On the 13th of the same month a petition in bankruptcy was presented against Pearson, and on the 20th another receiver, Mr. Curling, was appointed under this petition. On the 18th of the same month there was a meeting of creditors under the liquidation. The petitioning creditor in the bankruptcy was himself appointed trustee under the liquidation, and the bankruptcy proceedings dropped. The receiver in liquidation took possession, on the 14th of August, of the business premises of the debtor in Old Change, and of his private residence at Peckham, and remained in possession up to October 20. The receiver in bankruptcy went into possession at Old Change on his appointment, and retained possession until September 29. Both receivers subsequently carried in their bills for taxation. Mr. Clarke's estimate of the value of his personal services was £35 7s. 5d., and he put down possession money and other expenses at the two houses, £25 12s. 8d.; together, £61 0s. 1d. Mr. Curling's personal charges were stated at £21 9s. 11d., and his possession money at Old Change, £9 13s. 6d., together £31 3s. 5d., constituting a total charge by the two of £91 3s. 6d. These bills coming before the master, he refused to treat them as other than one bill, and taxed accordingly, stating, in his memorandum, that in his opinion the appointment of two receivers was utterly unnecessary; that the fact of Mr. Clarke being already in possession did not seem to have been mentioned to the court when application was made to Mr. Registrar Spring-Rice to appoint Mr. Curling; and that for this omission he held all the parties to be more or less liable to blame, and that, without the express order of the court to the contrary, he should allow but one set of costs, which he should divide between the two receivers. This was on the 21st of May, 1874, and on the 8th of February, 1875, said Mr. Registrar Hazlitt—"I am asked by Mr. Clarke's solicitor to make such an express order. This order I refuse to make. The solicitor contends that the master, in exercising the discretion upon which he proceeded, acted altogether *ultrà vires*, and that he had no authority whatever to go behind the two orders appointing the two concurrent receivers. Until overruled by superior authority, I shall hold that the master's discretion was not only sound in principle, but warrantable in practice. The mere dates, in my opinion, required that such discretion should intervene. The amount in question may be small, in comparison with the enormous spoliation of estates daily created by the charges of professional receivers and professional trustees, but the principle is the same." The learned registrar, in dismissing the application with costs, added, "What the personal services of these receivers may have been I cannot say, but where, as is so frequently the case, the same accountant is receiver, or trustee, under a dozen or a score, or even more, different estates, his capacity for personal service in each case must be a very extraordinarily ubiquitous power."

"A Dublin Solicitor" writes to the *Times* to contradict the assertions made at the recent bar meeting that the appointment of a second judge in the Landed Estates Court is absolutely necessary, and in particular to correct a statement then made that the arrears in the preliminary stages of the proceedings were so great that an estate could not now be sold (no matter how simple was the title) in less than two years, and that every estate, as a rule, remained a great deal longer. "I examined," he says, "the files of the court, and I have selected at random twenty-five estates which have been sold in the Landed Estates Court during the last year, and I give below in a tabular form the date of the filing of the petition, the date of sale, and the date of the hearing of the schedule of incumbrances in each case." From the table thus given it appears that, so far from the estates in question "having taken two years to sell, not alone were they sold, but the proceeds of them were allocated and distributed within periods ranging from five months to twenty months from the date of the filing of the petition. Indeed, any solicitor who practises in the Landed Estates Court can testify that the wheels of the court are revolving just as rapidly now as they ever did. I could produce many proofs of the truth of my assertion. Let us take one which is an almost infallible test of the work which is being done in the court, viz., the number of final schedules of incumbrances heard annually, for the hearing of the schedules is the winding up of the proceedings in each case. Up to the year 1872 there were two judges in the Landed Estates Court; since that year there has been only one. Now, if we compare the number of final schedules heard in each year since 1870, we shall find that Judge Flanagan has, since the death of his late colleague, wound up just as many estates in each year as used to be wound up annually by the two judges together. The number of final schedules heard was, in 1870, 191; 1871, 198; 1872, 191; 1873, 191; 1874, 194."

When that much-needed work, the *Juryman's Complete Guide*, is prepared, it is to be hoped that the compiler will not overlook the following elaborate judicial exposition of the principles which should regulate the decisions of juries in actions by men for breach of promise, given by Brett, J., on Thursday last, in the case of *Townsend* v. *Bennett*. "If a man had been for years kissed by a woman, he certainly was not much the worse for it—but if a woman had been for years kissed by a man, and the engagement was broken off, would that render any other man quite so desirous as he might otherwise have been to kiss her? If a woman happened to be jilted, people were apt to consider before they determined to be a second suitor. But did this apply to a man? A man could not go crying about the world that he had been jilted by a woman. Again, when women got towards middle life it happened that they did not readily get married; but a middle-aged man had much less difficulty in getting a wife than a woman had a husband. The jury must judge why that was; he was sure he did not know. All women were creatures that should be worked for by men, and no man—that was, no real man—had any other thought; and women, except in the case of a few strong-minded ladies, thought that their business was to stay at home and mind the family; and men thought so too. When a woman became engaged she looked forward to a comfortable home, where she would be worked for; and that prospect she would lose by the engagement being broken off. A man, however, after the breach of such an engagement, would have the same power of working for himself as before, and in this respect, therefore, the man was not in the same position as the woman. There were some persons—judges among them—who thought that no action of this nature should be permitted to be brought, but others thought that in such a case a woman might well be allowed to sue. The jury might consider whether they thought that any man should bring such an action for compensation for his wounded feelings. A man was a more robust creature than a woman; he had enjoyed her society for years, and simply enjoyed it no more, but still he could work for himself as well as he did before. As to 'wounded feelings,' they would ask themselves whether a man could bring such an action except for a money loss."

In the case of *Keefe* v. *Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company*, an action, says the *Albany Law Journal*, was brought by a child, seven years of age, to recover for personal injuries caused by defendants' alleged neglect in allowing a turntable, situated in a public place, to remain unfastened and unguarded, and permitting children, among whom was plaintiff, to turn and play upon the table. The Supreme Court of Minnesota held that it was error to give judgment for defendants on the pleadings. It was also held that the plaintiff occupied a very different position from that of a mere voluntary transgressor upon the defendants' property; and that when the defendants set before young children a temptation which they had reason to believe will lead them into danger they must use ordinary care to protect them from harm. What would be proper care is for the jury to decide. *Townsend* v. *Wathen* (9 East, 277) was cited by the court. It was held in that case to be unlawful for a

man to allure even his neighbour's dogs into danger by setting traps on his own land, baited with strong-scented meat. And the court say that the defendants, in the present case, knew that leaving the turn-table unfastened and unguarded, was not merely inviting young children to come upon the turn-table, but was holding out an allurement which, upon the natural instincts by which children are controlled, drew them into a hidden danger.

PUNISHMENT FOR CRIMES OF VIOLENCE.

A BLUEBOOK just issued contains the replies to the circular issued by the Home Secretary on this subject. That circular proposed the following queries:—1. Is the penal law against crimes of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling crimes on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other, sufficiently stringent, and, if not, in what way should it be amended? 2. Are there any kinds of assaults which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at assizes or quarter sessions? 3. Is it desirable that the maximum fine, or the maximum term of imprisonment, which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended? 4. Should flogging be authorized for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44, especially in cases of assaults on women and children? 5. Has flogging been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorized as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44? To the first question Cockburn, C.J., Mellor, J., Lush, J., Kelly, C.B., Bramwell, B., Pigott, B., and Pollock, B., reply that the present law is not sufficiently stringent; while Archibald, J., Coleridge, C.J., Keating, J., Brett, J., Denman, J., and Amphlett, B., think that it is.

On the general subject the Lord Chief Justice of England says that "the maximum fine and the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended. And I say this, not only because I believe that the punishment which such courts are now empowered to inflict is not in itself sufficiently severe, but also because I think that, by increasing the penalty which such courts are empowered to impose, magistrates will be encouraged to treat assaults of this nature with greater severity than (judging from the reports of such cases as published in the newspapers) they have hitherto been in the habit of dealing with them. I am of opinion that flogging has been found efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorized as a punishment by the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. I think that flogging may well be authorized for violence in cases of brutal assault, where, from the nature of the assault, it appears that bodily injury to the person was intended, and such injury has actually resulted." Mr. Justice Blackburn remarks, "I have long thought that though penal servitude is thought a very severe punishment, the dread of it does not operate so as to deter persons from what may be called crimes of malicious mischief, such, for instance, as setting fire to property by ill-conditioned tramps, with no particular malice against the owner; or putting obstructions on railways, without any particular ill-will to those whose lives and property are thus endangered. And I should expect that the knowledge that the punishment might commence with flogging would, in such cases, be deterring. I incline to think that it would also operate as deterring in cases of brutal violence, though I feel less sure of this. On the other hand, if the sentence of the law was to make the criminal the subject of sympathy to his class, and lead him to be regarded by them as a martyr, this would prevent it from being deterring. On the whole, I think it would be advisable to try the experiment, both in the class of cases to which I have alluded of malicious mischief, and in aggravated or repeated assaults." Mr. Justice Quain goes so far as to say that "Flogging is the only punishment (except the punishment of death) that seems to retain any real deterrent power about it;" but he thinks that "there is one difficulty about it, that some sentimental judges will not inflict it;" and he rather facetiously recommends that justices in petty sessions should be empowered to order a moderate birching "on the proper place" on boy offenders.

In answer to the fifth question, Mr. Justice Lush says:—"When I first went to Manchester, in the spring of 1866, there was a general feeling of alarm at the prevalence of what is called 'garrotting.' It had increased, notwithstanding that heavy sentences of penal servitude had been awarded at the previous assizes. I flogged every one—as many, I think, as twenty or twenty-one. I went again in the summer of the same year, and had to administer the same punishment to about half the number. I have been there five times since, and have, I believe, only had one such case, and that was three or four years ago. The same result has followed at Leeds and Chester, and the crime has all but disappeared. From what I have seen and heard from the prisoners, some of whom have implored me to give any term of penal servitude rather than the 'cat,' and from what I have been told by governors of gaols, I have no doubt that flogging is more dreaded than any amount of imprisonment or penal servitude, and that the suppression of 'garrotting' is attributable solely to this kind of punishment." Mr. Baron Pollock says: "Before I had experience as a judge I was not in favour of flogging, nor did I believe in its efficacy. I have now been five circuits in the Northern and Midland counties, and from what I have seen and heard in court, and also from what I have gathered in conversation with magistrates, governors of prisons, and others, I am thoroughly satisfied that the practice of flogging has worked well and gone far to put an end to systematic robberies with violence."

On the other hand Mr. Justice Keating, in answer to questions 4 and 5, remarks—"These questions involve the propriety of reintroducing into our penal code, or extending the retrograde legislation of former times, the flogging of adults as a punishment, a system in my opinion likely to produce the most pernicious results. The 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44, was passed during a panic, occasioned by some audacious robberies with violence in the metropolis, and it was even proposed to make the sentence obligatory upon the judges; not being so, I myself have never passed it, nor do I believe I am singular in that respect. I know the late Mr. Justice Willes, who thought much upon such subjects, was wholly opposed to it. The punishment is simply retaliatory, a principle I had supposed long since exploded. It is also most unequal in its application; the number of lashes that would bring down the pulse of one man to a faint, will be taken by another with comparative indifference, and yet the judge who passes the sentence has not the means of discriminating. It is true all punishments are more or less unequal, but their inequality can be in some degree corrected, but not so with the punishment of flogging. It is neither reformatory nor deterrent, which are the great objects of all punishments."

General Correspondence.

TOUTING CIRCULARS.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—The enclosed circular has just come into my hands from a lady friend. A.

[The following is the circular referred to by our correspondent. We may remark that the lithographed address, "29, Craven-street," is struck out in ink, and "106, Strand, W.C.," is written in ink above it, and that the first letter of the second name in the partnership appears in the circular to be intended for "K.," but we are informed that the name written up at the address indicated is Vernède.—ED. *S. J.*]

"106, Strand, W.C.,
Charing Cross,
London, ———, 1874.

Mrs. ———

Madame [*sic*],

We trust you will excuse us [*sic*] taking the liberty of forwarding you this letter, but having observed that a Bill of Sale is registered against you and as such things are very often the commencement of trouble and inability to meet your creditors, we beg to suggest that if it should so occur that you are under any apprehension of being unable to meet your liabilities, that [*sic*] it will be well for you to consult a Respectable Solicitor, who will advise you as to the course to be persued [*sic*] and it is better to do this,

before you get so far into difficulties as to render your case very difficult to arrange.

A personal interview will not cost you anything, and our long practice with persons in embarrassed circumstances, enables us to suggest immediate relief and assistance and under the Act of 1869, without publicity and suspension of business. Yours faithfully,

CARPENTER & KERNEDE."

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The usual weekly meeting of this society was held on Tuesday evening last at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, Mr. T. W. Ratcliff, jun., in the chair. Messrs. Henry, Chater, Pitt, and Dickinson were duly elected members of the society. The question appointed for discussion was No. 553 Legal:—"A. gives the residue of his real and personal estate to B. and C. as joint tenants; C. is one of the attesting witnesses to the will; will B. take the whole?" After a lengthy debate the question was carried in the affirmative by a majority of eight votes.

Obituary.

SIR JAMES HURTLE FISHER.

A telegram from Adelaide announces the death on the 28th ult. of Sir James Hurtle Fisher, Knight, late President of the Legislative Assembly of South Australia. Sir J. Fisher was the son of Mr. James Fisher, architect, and was born in London in 1790. He practised for many years as a solicitor in partnership with Mr. Thomas Rhodes at 9, Davies-street, Grosvenor-square. In 1836 he was appointed Resident Commissioner of Public Lands for South Australia, and he has ever since been resident in Adelaide and has been five times mayor of that city. In 1853 he was elected chairman of the magistrates, and he was a member of the first executive council of the colony. He was for several years Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and in 1856 he was appointed President of the Assembly. In 1865 he was knighted by patent in consideration of his long public services. A few years ago he retired from office on account of advanced age.

MR. CHARLES JEFFERY.

Mr. Charles Jeffery, barrister-at-law, district judge in Jamaica, died at Mentone on the 4th inst. at the age of thirty-six. Mr. Jeffery was the son of the late Mr. J. R. Jeffery of Liverpool, and was born in 1839. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated as a junior optime in 1863, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1865. He became a member of the Northern Circuit, practising also at the Liverpool Sessions and Liverpool Court of Passage. Mr. Jeffery was one of the joint editors of the third edition of Chitty's "Precedents of Pleadings." In 1871 he was appointed judge of the District Court of Falmouth, in Jamaica. Unfortunately his constitution was not strong enough to endure the heat of the climate, and he had come to Europe, on leave of absence in the hope of reviving his health and strength, but without avail.

MR. GEORGE CORNELIUS STIGANT.

Mr. George Cornelius Stigant, solicitor, of Portsea, died at his residence at Portland-place, Southsea, on the 29th ult., in his seventy-sixth year. The deceased was the oldest solicitor in the borough of Portsmouth, having practised there ever since his admission in 1821. He was a commissioner for taking affidavits in all the courts, and a perpetual commissioner for Hampshire, and had a very large practice. He took a warm interest in all the municipal business of the borough, having been connected with the corporation for thirty-four years, in the successive capacities of town councillor and alderman. He was four times Mayor of Portsmouth, viz., in 1851, 1852, 1853, and 1855. He had devoted much attention to the question of local taxation, and gave some valuable evidence before the select committee which sat to consider that subject a few years ago. Mr. Stigant was also a liberal supporter of the local charities, and he was for several years the chairman of the house committee of the Portsmouth and Gosport Hospital. His politics were Conservative, and he was formerly secretary of the South Hants Registration Association, and managed several elections for his party.

Appointments, Etc.

Mr. WILLIAM BEDE DALLEY, barrister, has been appointed Attorney-General of New South Wales in the new Ministry for that colony. Mr. Dalley was called to bar at Sydney in 1856.

Mr. JOHN LLOYD GRIFFITH, solicitor, of Holyhead, has been appointed by the Lord Lieutenant of Anglesey (the Hon. William Owen Stanley) to the office of Clerk of the Peace for that county, in the place of the late Mr. Richard Owen, of Beaumaris. Mr. Lloyd Griffith was formerly foundation scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and was admitted a solicitor in 1865. He is clerk to the Holyhead Local Board of Health, clerk to Holyhead Burial Board, clerk to the magistrates, and notary public.

Mr. CHARLES SMITH, solicitor, of Ongar, has been appointed Clerk to the Dagenham School Board. Mr. Smith was admitted in 1864, and is clerk to the county magistrates, to the Commissioners of Taxes at Ongar, and secretary to the West Essex Conservative Registration Association, &c.

Mr. RICHARD GARTH, Q.C., has been appointed Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature at Calcutta in the place of Sir Richard Couch, resigned. Mr. Garth is the son of the Rev. Richard Garth, of Farnham, Surrey. He was born in 1820, and was educated at Eton and Christchurch, Oxford, where he graduated as B.A. in 1842, and as M.A. in 1845. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1847, when he joined the Home Circuit and Surrey Sessions. He was made a Queen's Counsel in 1866, and in the same year (on the promotion of the late Sir William Bovill to the Chief Justiceship of the Court of Common Pleas) he was elected M.P. for Guildford in the Conservative interest. By the Reform Act of 1867 Guildford lost one of its members, and at the general election of 1868 Mr. Garth was defeated, by a small majority, by his former colleague, Mr. Guildford Onslow. Mr. Garth is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn.

Mr. GEORGE HENRY COLE, solicitor, of 1, Church-court, Clement's-lane, has been appointed a London Commissioner for taking Affidavits in all the Courts of Common Law.

Mr. RICHARD SMITH MASON, solicitor, of 63, Lincoln's-inn-fields, has been appointed a London Commissioner for taking Affidavits in the Court of Exchequer.

Mr. HENRY LINDON RILEY, solicitor, of St. Helen's, Lancashire, has been appointed a Commissioner for taking Affidavits in the Court of Exchequer.

The vestry of the parish of Paddington have fixed Tuesday next, the 16th inst., for the election of a solicitor to the vestry, in the room of the late Mr. Frederic James Fuller.

The Common Council of the City of London will meet on Monday, March 1, for the purpose of electing a Deputy Registrar to the Mayor's Court. The salary is £300 a year, and solicitors of five years' standing are alone eligible for the office.

The Leeds Town Council have refused an application by Mr. William Bruce, the stipendiary magistrate for the borough, for an increase of his salary from £1,000 to £1,250 per annum.

Legal Items.

It is understood that Mr. Justice Honyman has definitely resigned his position as judge.

The Northampton Town Council have agreed to raise the salary of Mr. William Shoosmith, the town clerk, from £250 to £500 per annum.

At a meeting of the Bristol Town Council last week, a resolution in favour of the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate was rejected.

Mr. Staveley Hill gave notice in the House of Commons on Tuesday, that on March 9 he would call attention to the present mode of drafting amendment Bills and amending clauses in Bills, and would move a resolution.

In a recent case before Vice-Chancellor Malins, it was stated that a newspaper reporter was present at the cross-examination of a witness before the special examiner. The Vice-Chancellor expressed an opinion that the special examiner should hold his sittings in private.

On Thursday week at a crowded public meeting, held in the Town Hall, Middlesborough—the mayor (Mr. T. Hughbell) presiding—a resolution was adopted in support of the appointment by the Town Council of a stipendiary magistrate for the administration of justice within the borough of Middlesborough.

The *Staffordshire Advertiser* states that, during the past few years, an earthenware manufacturer, of Cobridge, has repeatedly been before the magistrates at Burslem for drunken and disorderly conduct. He has been forgiven, he has been fined, he has been imprisoned, and about three weeks since he was called upon, all other courses having failed to bring him to reason, to find for his good behaviour two sureties to the amount of not less than £600—himself in £300 and bondsmen to the like amount. The recognizances demanded were at once entered into, but on Tuesday the defendant was again before the bench, who sent him to prison for one month, and directed that the requisite steps should be taken for the forfeiture of the recognizances.

The *Scotsman* understands that the Lord Advocate is about to introduce into Parliament a Bill effecting important changes in the whole judicial system of Scotland. Its general object may be described as the transfer of a large amount of legal business from the Court of Session to the Sheriff Courts. The main proposal is to extend the jurisdiction of the inferior courts to questions affecting heritage to an extent not exceeding the value of £2,000, to actions of declarator, to the reduction of deeds, and to such matters of administration as the appointment of tutors and curators. It is rumoured that there is also an intention to reduce the number of Lords Ordinary in the Court of Session by two—a step which would probably be accompanied or followed by an increase in the salaries of the remaining judges.

The City Lands Committee of the Corporation of London, says the *Times*, have recently had their attention called, through the Lord Mayor, to inconveniences which have long beset the administration of justice at the Sessions-house in the Old Bailey. The Court-house is a constant source of annoyance to everybody having business there. The approaches to the building are tortuous and bewildering to all but those whom business takes there from month to month, and who thus necessarily become familiar with its peculiarities and manage to find their way about. The principal court is literally in a hole, to which access is for the most part tedious and difficult. The accommodation provided for the bar is restricted and somewhat mean; witnesses have to herd together in the adjacent passages, exposed at times to a cutting north wind, and seldom to be found when wanted. The jurymen in attendance fare somewhat better, in that a considerable section of the area of the court is appropriated to their special accommodation; and it is proper that it should be so, seeing that the business in hand might at any time be retarded, and the bench and parties seriously inconvenienced by any lack of their attendance. For persons of consideration—foreigners and others—visiting the courts, a portion of the bench is always available through the courtesy of the sheriffs and under-sheriffs for the time being; while a few seats—somewhat difficult of access, by the way—are set apart for ladies. The general public, on the other hand, are represented by as many of their order as can conveniently or inconveniently pack themselves in a gallery of very limited dimensions immediately over the prisoners' dock. Matters are now in a fair way of amendment, though probably the inherent defects of the courts will only be entirely cured by their complete reconstruction on a more commodious site and on a better plan.

Courts.

*BANKRUPTCY.**

(Before the Hon. W. C. Spring-Rice, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Jan. 5.—*Re Skinner.*

A debtor, upon presenting a petition for liquidation, omitted from the list of creditors the name of a person who was then suing him in the Lord Mayor's Court, and whose claim he disputed.

The creditor not receiving notice of the petition, proceeded with his action, and recovered judgment. The debtor then gave notice of the petition, but the creditor levied an execution.

Upon an application being made by the debtor and the receiver for an order on the Sergeant at Mace to withdraw,

Held that the order might go, but only upon payment by the receiver out of the estate of the additional costs to which the creditor had been put by reason of the want of proper notice of the first meeting.

This was an application on behalf of a debtor, who had filed a petition for liquidation by arrangement or composition, and the receiver appointed thereunder, for an order requiring the Sergeant at Mace of the City of London to withdraw from possession of the goods of the debtor.

On the 22nd of December, 1874, the debtor filed a petition for liquidation, and on the same day a receiver was appointed. The debtor (a trader) was then being sued in the Lord Mayor's Court by a person named Hull, who claimed to be a creditor for a sum of about £40 for goods sold and delivered, but, the debtor disputing his liability, Mr. Hull was not inserted in the list of creditors, and he did not then receive notice of the filing of the petition. On the 1st of January, the debtor obtained an order for leave to carry in an additional "request," containing Mr. Hull's name, and on the following day the cause of *Hull* v. *Skinner* was tried in the Lord Mayor's Court, and resulted in a verdict for the plaintiff, and judgment was then signed. On the 4th of January (Sunday intervening) Hull received notice of the petition, and of the first meeting of creditors, and on the same day, the Sergeant at Mace caused an execution to be levied upon the goods of the debtor for the amount of the debt and costs.

Brough, in support of the application.—The judgment creditor in this case had no right to cause a levy to be made after notice of an act of bankruptcy: *Re Thorpe*, 21 W. R. 327. [Spring-Rice, Registrar.—The difficulty here is, that the creditor did not receive notice of the act of bankruptcy until after he had been allowed to proceed to judgment.] The debtor, immediately he discovered the mistake, took steps to rectify it, and the creditor had notice of the first meeting, in ample time to enable him to attend it.

Stopher (solicitor).—The debtor omitted the name of the creditor from the list, and the creditor had not that notice of the first meeting which is necessary in order to bind him. *Re Thorpe* does not apply, for, in that case, the debt of the creditor was inserted in the list, and he had notice of the proceedings. The costs having been incurred subsequently to the filing of the petition, are not proveable.

Brough, in reply, as to the right to prove for the costs, cited *Ex parte Llynvi Coal Company, re Hide*, 20 W. R. 105, L. R. 7 Ch. 28.

Spring-Rice, Registrar.—I think it was the duty of the debtor in this case to have inserted the debt as a disputed debt. If that had been done, all difficulty would have been avoided. As it is, the creditor has been allowed to proceed with his action, and incur additional costs. The order may go, but I think only upon payment by the receiver out of the estate of the additional costs to which the creditor has been put by reason of the want of proper notice of the first meeting.

Solicitor for the receiver, *Greatorex*.

* Reported by J. C. Brough, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

(Before Mr. Registrar PEPYS, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Jan. 29.—*Re Kettle.*

Registration allowed of duplicate resolution for liquidation by arrangement where original resolution has been lost.

In this case the creditors assembled at the first meeting passed a resolution for liquidation by arrangement, but through some accident the resolution had been lost.

Michael (solicitor) applied for permission to file a duplicate resolution, duly verified, in lieu of the original. The application, he admitted, was a novel one, and he could not find any precedent for it, but he contended that the paper writing signed by the creditors was merely the evidence of the wishes of the creditors, and could not be considered as the resolution itself. In support of the application, he produced an affidavit showing that the creditors desired a duplicate resolution to be filed and registered.

PEPYS, Registrar, thought strong grounds had been shown in support of the application, and allowed a duplicate resolution to be filed.

Application granted.

Parliament and Legislation.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

Feb. 5.—The LORD CHANCELLOR read the Queen's Speech, of which the portion relating to the legislation of the session was as follows:—

"The various statutes of an exceptional or temporary nature now in force for the preservation of peace in Ireland will be brought to your notice with a view to determine whether some of them may not be dispensed with.

"Several measures which were unavoidably postponed at the end of last session will be again introduced. Among the most important are those for simplifying the transfer of land and completing the reconstruction of the Judicature.

"Bills will be also laid before you for facilitating the Improvement of the Dwellings of the Working Classes in large towns; for the consolidation and amendment of the Sanitary Laws; and for the prevention of the pollution of rivers.

"A measure has been prepared for consolidating and amending the laws relating to friendly societies. Its object will be to assist, without unnecessarily interfering with, the laudable efforts of my people to make provision for themselves against some of the calamities of life.

"A Bill for the amendment of the Merchant Shipping Acts will be laid before you.

"Your attention will be moreover directed to legislation for the better security of my subjects from personal violence, and for more effectually providing for the trial of offences by establishing the office of a public prosecutor.

"Although the report of the commission issued by me to inquire into the state and working of the law as to offences connected with trade has not yet been made to me, I trust that any legislation on this subject which may be found to be expedient may take place in the present session.

"You will also be invited to consider a measure for improving the law as to agricultural tenancies."

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Feb. 9.—JUDICATURE ACT AMENDMENT.

The LORD CHANCELLOR in introducing a Bill on this subject said the Bill is identical in its general proposals with the Bill introduced last year. As the time drew near for bringing into operation the Act of 1873, some matters of detail were discovered which required correction, and which it is proposed to amend by this Bill. It is proposed in the Bill that the rules to regulate procedure and practice under the Act of 1873 shall all be in one code, and that this code shall derive its force from an order in Council. This was what was contemplated in respect of the second set of rules; but if the Bill should be passed the whole of the rules will derive their authority in that way. They will all be in one instrument, and will all be subject after the passing of the Act of Parliament to alteration by the judges like any other of the rules of court.—Lord REDESDALE expressed a hope that their lordships would not part with the appellate jurisdiction of their lordships' House without taking the opinion of the legal profession in England. From what he had heard, he believed firmly that the opinion of that profession was against the proposed transfer. There had been a movement on the subject among the English bar, and a committee, which included some very eminent members of the profession, had been formed for the purpose of preserving the appellate jurisdiction of their lordships' House. There was no reason why their lordships should not have the opinion of the judges on the subject.—Lord SELBORNE asked, what are the judges to be consulted about? Is it about amending an Act of Parliament passed two years ago, which, though its operation is in abeyance, is the law of the land, and by which that House has agreed that in substitution of their appellate jurisdiction there shall be one final Court of Appeal which is to collect within itself all final appellate jurisdiction so far as England is concerned? Are the judges to be consulted as to whether that Act is to be repealed? He ventured to say that such a course would be wholly without precedent in either ancient or modern times. Two years before the Judicature Act of 1873 was laid on the table of the House, the Chief Justice of England stated, as the result of his careful consideration of the subject and of his criticism of proposals at that time before the House, that the time had come when that House would best consult its own dignity by surrendering its shadowy jurisdiction as a court of final appeal, which stood in the way of putting the appellate jurisdiction of the country on a stronger and more satisfactory footing. At the time when he placed the Bill on the table of the House he thought it right to communicate it to every judge sitting on the bench in this country, and not from one of them did he hear any disapproval of the proposal for the transfer of the jurisdiction of that House.—Lord HATHERLEY said that when, three years ago, his noble friend (Lord Redesdale) was taking a part in a committee which was considering the question of the court of ultimate appeal, he had an opportunity of bringing forward his proposal to consult the judges, but he did not do so.

The Bill was read a first time.

LAND TRANSFER.

The LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving for leave to introduce a Bill on this subject, said it was, to a great extent, one proceeding on the same principle as the Bill of last year, but the arrangements of the Bill of last year have been considerably altered. As regards the drawing, the Bill has been abbreviated and its enactments have been greatly simplified. But there was one point of difference which he ought to at once notice and explain. The first Bill by which it was proposed to register title to land was one which he introduced in the other House of Parliament in 1859. That Bill did not propose to make the registry compulsory in every case. The Bill introduced two years ago by Lord Selborne did not make registration compulsory in the case of an estate not changing hands, but provided that wherever, after the lapse of a certain time, the estate was bought and sold, the title must be placed on the register. It further provided that if it were not so placed the buying and selling would only be regarded in the light of a contract, but would not pass what lawyers call "the real estate" in the land. When he introduced the Bill of last session he followed the course thus marked out, but he extended the term within which the obligation was not to come in force from two years to three. As the Bill was in its progress through Parliament last year he had communications on the subject from all parts of the country, and on going into details he acquired a great deal of information of which he had not been previously in possession. In one particular neighbourhood—that of Birmingham—there are in the course of the year a great many hundreds of cases of buying and selling pieces of land. Their lordships would be astonished to hear how small are some of those transactions—how minute the portion of property, and how comparatively inconsiderable the amount of purchase-money. There are parts of England in which a great deal is done in buying land enough to build a cottage on. These sales are not conducted in the way in which people make out a title to land. They are transacted entirely on the faith of the solicitor, who has been conducting business in the particular neighbourhood for a long time, and is supposed to know it thoroughly. He draws up the deed in, perhaps, two hours, and besides the stamp money

the purchaser has to pay but a very small sum in the way of law costs. His lordship had heard of cases in which these latter charges have varied between 15s. and 30s. Now, if a title is to be put on the register, there must be some investigation of title, however small; and it would be impossible in a system of registry to compete with the small expense at which those minute transactions are now conducted. Therefore, before the Bill of last year left that House he proposed to exempt from the operation of the compulsory clause all cases in which the purchase-money did not reach a certain amount (£300), but he was obliged to arrive at conclusions in a rough form. Since last year he had given the subject much consideration, and he had arrived at the conclusion that it must appear somewhat anomalous to introduce a compulsory registry and then draw a line between a purchase of greater and one of lesser magnitude. It is extremely difficult to fix the point at which the line should be drawn. He thought it necessary to ask the question, What, after all, is gained by a compulsory registry of this kind? Their lordships would observe that the compulsory registry proposed was not one of all estates, but merely of those which were the subject of sale. These would be the exceptions, because the great bulk of the property in this country never changes hands and never becomes the subject of sale. Therefore, the course proposed would not effect the object they had mainly in view, which was to have all the land of the country on the register. Then, again, even where those pieces of land are the subject of sale, there must be exceptions, whether you fix the minimum at £300, £200, or £100. But there would remain still these sales of a class over those small pieces, and in these, however stringent you might make your compulsory clause, the ingenuity of conveyancers would be able to defeat it. Already means have been suggested by which any one who did not wish to come under the compulsory law might escape it. Moreover, there appeared to him to be a further difficulty in making a measure of this kind compulsory. If you do so you cannot stop short of establishing all over the country district registries, because obviously it would be a great hardship for persons living in remote parts of the country, and who were anxious and willing to conduct a sale without coming to London, to have to come to London to register the sale. Now, to establish registries all over the country would be a measure of fresh expense, and one in which they would hardly be justified without experience as to the desire of buyers to avail themselves of the register. These considerations had led him to think that the proper way was to proceed in the hope that the registration will commend itself to the owners of land as making the land more negotiable, and, therefore, more valuable. If that commends itself to the extent of making owners go to the registry, in that way, just as it is acted upon throughout the country, they would be able to decide as to the places in which it would be necessary to establish district registries: and they need not incur expense in that way until it is required. For these reasons there was not in this Bill the clause of the Bill of last year which made registration compulsory.

The Bill was read a first time, and the LORD CHANCELLOR fixed the second readings of both his Bills for that day fortnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Feb. 8.—DWELLINGS FOR THE WORKING CLASSES.

Mr. CROSS, in introducing a Bill on the subject, said that it was confined to the metropolis, and to large towns. The Act was to be put in motion by the medical officer, who would be bound to report whether in his opinion the place was an unhealthy district and whether that was attributable to the badness of the houses. If he found it so, he would have to state that in his opinion it was an unhealthy district, and that an improvement scheme ought to be framed for it. That report would be forwarded to the local authority—being in London the corporation, in the rest of the metropolis the Metropolitan Board of Works, and in large towns the town council. The local authority would then take the matter into their consideration, and if satisfied of the truth of the report, and the practicability of applying a remedy and of the sufficiency of their resources, they would pass a resolution that the district was an unhealthy area for which an improvement scheme ought to be provided. The improvement scheme would be accompanied by maps, particulars, and estimates, defining the lands it was proposed to take with compulsory powers, and providing for as many of the working classes as might be displaced in that area, either within the limits of the area or the vicinity thereof. When it has been determined that an area is unhealthy and that there shall be an improvement scheme in the metropolis, it is to be referred to the Secretary of State, who will make inquiry, and if he be satisfied with the scheme will take upon himself the responsibility of passing the provisional order through the House. In the case of boroughs the President of the Local Government Board is to pass the improvement schemes through Parliament. In order to arrive at the value of the lands thus compulsorily taken an arbitrator will be appointed who will go down to the locality and inquire into all the circumstances. If, however, the owner of any property proposed to be compulsorily taken wishes to appeal to a jury against the decision of the arbitrator, he will have the right of doing so. The basis of the valuation will be the fair market value of the land. Ample power is given to the local authority to let or sell the property, on the express condition that there shall be accommodation for the labouring classes. Power is, moreover, given to the local authority to build in special cases, with the consent of the Secretary of State, or of the President of the Local Government Board. Powers are given for borrowing and lending to the local authority by the Public Works Commissioners at a certain rate of interest.

The Bill was read a first time.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER brought in a Bill to consolidate and amend the laws relating to Friendly Societies. The principles of the Bill were mainly the same as those of the Bill of last session; but the following alterations were made. The proposals for local registration were dropped and registrations will be carried on in the same way as at present, except that the registrars of Scotland and Ireland will be subordinated to the chief office in London. The provision that the registrar should, under certain circumstances, have power not only to order the dissolution of a society upon the representation of a certain proportion of its members, but to re-arrange and alter the benefits and the contributions of the society, was omitted. The provision directing that the registrar shall cause tables of mortality to be prepared for the use of the societies was also dropped, but it was the intention of the Government to give directions for the preparation of such tables, applicable to different sets of cases, and to furnish them to the societies. It was proposed somewhat to alter the proportion of members who may call for a general meeting of the society. It was proposed to omit certain words with regard to the appointment of public valuers which have been misunderstood, and it was provided that the valuers shall be appointed by the societies themselves, merely requiring that the name, address, and profession of such valuers shall be stated, that they may be known as persons of some standing. There would also be some change made with regard to the investments, allowing a much greater latitude in the form of their investments in order to assist the societies to improve their position, subject to certain necessary precautions. They proposed to do away with the restriction which it was intended to impose with regard to the insurance of children under three years of age, in so far as it extended to a prohibition of insurance in more than one society.

The Bill was read a first time.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS.

Sir C. ADDERLEY, in moving for leave to introduce an Amendment Bill, said that the Bill will render illegal the system of advance notes, and will recast the criminal code of the Marine Service. The Bill takes out of the hands of the Board of Trade and the local Marine Board, &c., charges against the certificated officers—masters, mates, and engineers—and places all such proceedings in the hands of the stipendiary magistrates; or, failing them, in the hands of the local Admiralty Courts. At the same time, it is proposed that the assessors should not be appointed, as hitherto, by the Board of Trade, which ought to be the prosecutor, and should not, therefore, share in the office of judge. These appointments will be made in future by the High Court of Admiralty. It is also proposed that if, before the new tribunal, a certificated officer should be convicted of incompetency, his certificate should in no case be suspended, but should be cancelled. As to the offences of

seamen, the Bill proposes to repeal all the existing enactments on this subject, and to make a better classification, graduation, and arrangement of many scattered enactments constituting what may be called the criminal code on this subject. The only addition to the list of offences will be one for neglect to keep a look-out or for sleeping on the watch. Double punishment will be inflicted in cases of drunkenness and other offences committed under circumstances which endanger the ship or the lives of those on board. The Bill also proposes a more summary process in the case of all offences short of mutiny. As to the safety of ships and seamen, the Bill provides greater securities for safety by dealing with overloading, deck-loads, boats, adjustment of compasses, and by increasing the liability of ship-owners for damages to persons or property arising from the unseaworthiness of ships. The Bill proposes to make a charge on the mercantile marine for the training of boys for the merchant service. Lastly, it makes a material improvement in the system of investigating casualties. The preliminary inquiry by the Receiver of Wrecks will remain the same as it is, except in so far as regards its extension to foreign ships and boats, the omission of the condition of material damages, and a slight improvement in the nature of the evidence. The formal inquiry which follows the preliminary one will be taken altogether out of the hands of the justices and placed in the hands of stipendiary magistrates or assessors appointed by the Admiralty.

The Bill was read a first time.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Mr. LOPES introduced a Bill to amend the Act of the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, relating to bills of sale.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN brought in a bill to amend the burial laws.

Mr. DIXON brought in a Bill to amend the Education Act, 1870, by making obligatory in England and Wales the attendance of children at school, and the formation of School Boards.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON brought in a Bill to enable owners and occupiers of property in certain districts to prevent the common sale of intoxicating liquors within such districts.

Mr. TREVELYAN brought in a Bill to extend household franchise to counties.

Mr. SALT brought in a Bill to provide facilities for the performance of public worship according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England.

Sir HARCOURT JOHNSTONE brought in a Bill to repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts 1864, 1866, 1868, and 1869.

Mr. FORSYTH brought in a Bill for removing the electoral disabilities of women.

Mr. PLIMSOLL brought in a Bill to amend the laws relating to merchant shipping.

Sir. H. JAMES brought in a Bill to provide for the remuneration of Returning Officers at Parliamentary Elections.

Mr. WADDY brought in a Bill to remove doubts which have arisen in respect to the true interpretation of certain sections of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852.

Feb. 9.—THE WRIT FOR STROUD.

Mr. C. E. LEWIS moved "That no new writ be issued for the election of a member to serve in this present Parliament for the borough of Stroud, in the room of Henry R. Brand, Esq., whose election has been declared void, during the present Parliament." After describing the history of elections at Stroud during the last eighteen months, he proceeded to show that the House could exercise a discretion as to the issue of the writ. It might be convenient to consider how matters stood previous to the passing of the Act enabling both Houses of Parliament to join in praying for the issue of a commission of inquiry in cases of electoral corruption. Previous to that time (1854) the House had claimed a general discretion to suspend a writ. In the case of the borough of Stafford there was a vacancy in May, 1835, occasioned by the acceptance by the sitting member of the Chiltern Hundreds, and the strength of that case lay in the fact that it was not by reason of any corruption which had been proved as having occurred in the existing, but in the previous Parliament, between 1832 and 1834, that the House in the exercise of its discretion absolutely suspended the issue of a writ from the 18th of May, 1835, to the 13th of February, 1837. But it might be said that by reason of the passing of the Act enabling the House to punish a delinquent borough by means of a commission of inquiry, a totally new state of things had been introduced. In the case of Wakefield, however, a Commission was issued in 1859 which reported in 1860 that the corruption which prevailed was not such as justified them in advising that the borough should be disfranchised, but the House nevertheless refused to issue a new writ for two years after. If as a matter of principle the House had the power of suspending the issue of a writ for a week there was no good reason why it should not suspend it for any longer period.—Mr. YORKE seconded the motion.—Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT opposed the motion, and contended that no writ had ever been suspended from 1775 to the present time except with a view to ulterior proceedings—either an inquiry or a proposal for disfranchisement. The case at Ipswich, he said, was far worse than that of Stroud, and yet Sir Robert Peel said he would not oppose the issue of a writ for Ipswich. The resolution amounted to indefinite disfranchisement, but one House of Parliament had not the power to disfranchise a borough.—The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said, as far as he could make out, the law of the matter was very clear. Prior to the Act of 1854, under which a Commission might issue upon the application of both Houses of Parliament, no doubt writs were very frequently suspended, but a reference to the authorities on the subject showed that the writs were suspended in order that an investigation might be instituted for the purpose of ascertaining whether corrupt practices extensively prevailed, and with a view to the ultimate disfranchisement of the offending constituencies. Under the Act of Parliament in question, both Houses might petition her Majesty to issue a Commission upon the report of a committee appointed to try an election petition that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed, or upon the report of a committee appointed to inquire whether corrupt practices had extensively prevailed in any particular place. But unless there was such a report a Commission could not issue. Under a subsequent Act an election judge was substituted for the election committee, and as the law now stands a Commission cannot issue unless there is a report from the election judge that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed. The hon. member for Londonderry wished the writ for Stroud to be suspended, although the judge, instead of reporting that corrupt practices prevailed, had reported directly the contrary.—After some debate the motion was negatived on a division by 222 to 44.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Mr. WHITWELL introduced a Bill for the establishment of tribunals of commerce.

Mr. CHARLEY introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to infanticide; also a Bill to amend the law relating to offences against the person, and a Bill to amend the law relating to unqualified legal practitioners.

Sir T. CHAMBERS introduced a Bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

Feb. 11.—BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Lord ELCHO introduced a Bill for creating a county and municipality of London.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER introduced two Bills, the one to consolidate the Acts relating to loans for public works, and the other to amend the same Acts.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH introduced a Bill for consolidating and amending the Acts relating to public health in England.

Mr. DODDS brought in a Bill to amend the law regulating municipal elections.

Sir C. DILKE brought in a Bill to extend the Act of the second year of William IV., chapter 42, relating to allotments for the poor.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN introduced a Bill to require the registration with the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies of the names, addresses, and authority of the contractors or agents of any loan for foreign borrowers, whether for State, municipal, corporate, public works, or other purposes, together with the full terms and particulars of all contracts relating thereto, as well as the title and particulars of all property assigned or in any way pledged or charged for the repayment of such loans.

Mr. BOURKE brought in a Bill to amend the law relating to international copyright.

Court Papers.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

CAUSE LIST.

Sittings after Hilary Term, 1875.

Before the COURT OF APPEAL IN CHANCERY.

Appeal Motions.

Heugh v Garrett app of deft pt hd
In re The London, Birmingham, and South Staffordshire Bank (limd), and Co's Acts McDonald & Duff's cases app of liquidator
Vyse v Foster app of defts
Reynard v Arnold app of pltff

Appeals. 1874. (Standing over.)

Mayor, &c., of Hastings v Ivall M—1 July (app stayed by order)
Mutlow v L. M. Bigg H—22 Sept (pt hd, S O by order)
Collins v Slade B—Dec 16 (order appealed from not produced)

Appeals. (For hearing.)

Powell v Elliot Elliot v Powell B—Aug 3 pt hd
Aspden v Seddon R—Dec 10 (day to be fixed)
Gisborne v Gisborne H—Dec 24
Middlemas v Wilson B—Dec 28

1875.

Phelps v The Queen Insurance Co M—Jan 1
France v Carver R—Jan 7 app of deft, Wm Carver
France v Carver R—Jan 7 app of defts, John Ingle & anr
Williams v Games R—Jan 14
Aynsley v Glover R—Jan 16
Swete v Tindal M—Jan 18
Wilson v Thornbury M—Jan 18
Brooks v Sidebottom M—Jan 20
Ashlin v Lee H—Jan 28
Stanton v Baring B—Jan 29

Before the MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Causes set down previous to Transfer.

Harrison v The Mexican Ry Co (limd) dem
Horrocks v Bernstein c with wits (V C H)
Jarvis v Mortimer md Mortimer v Jarvis c with wits pt hd S O, to present a petition
Toone v Sarson c with wits (revived)
Forster v Longrigg m d (wits before exmnr)
Turner v Phillipson m d
Vickers v Brown c with wits pt hd S O by order
Williams v Guest, bart c with wits (Feb 16)
Hayter v Richardson sp c S O to amend
Macdougall v Glover c
The Printing and Numerical Registering Co (limd) v Sampson c with wits
Mustard v Botterell c with wits (Feb 24)
Newton v Daw m d with wits
Sykes v Marsland f c
Hiscock v Woodward m d
Davies v Longborne c with wits (Feb 9)
Taaffe v Vickerman c with wits (Feb 9)
Garnett v Garnett Ellis v Hayward f c
Duke of Devonshire v Mackinnon m d
Ross v Ross c
Johnson v Gamble f c 2 sms to vary cert & petn (Feb 9)
Barker v Adshead f c & sms to vary
Hall v Nevill c with wits
Whitehouse v Ryland f c
Sully v Trotter m d
Albert Mott v Shoolbred m d (wits before exmnr)
Alfred Mott v Shoolbred m d evdce in 1st suit to be read in 2nd suit
Griffiths v Griffiths m d
Bush v The Trowbridge Water Co m d (Feb 11)
Clarke v Porter m d
Broome v Broome c
Robertson v Pearse m d
Harrison v Poole m d
Beynon v Cook m d
Davies v Brittan f c
Goodridge v Ayling c
Powell v Stanborough f c
Collins v Hamer m d (wits before exmnr)
Bailey v Patchitt m d
Hall v Hoyle c
Durrans v Hyde m d
Denbigh v Vint m d
Hodgson v Gregory m d
Warre v Adams m d (short)
Tanner v Burra m d (short)
Sisson v Jones m d (short)
Heugh v Seard m d
Fowler v Robinson f c

Causes transferred from the book of the Vice-Chancellor Sir R. MALINS, by order dated 30th January, 1875.

Gurney v Brown c
Smith v Hersee m d
Mallard v Margary m d
Edmonds v Hartland m d
Morris v Kelland c
Dangerfield v Budd m d (wits before exmnr)
Young v Dale m d
Brogden v Macleod c
Green v Pyne m d
Richards v Richards m d
Ferrior v Evans m d
Miller v Kinlock c
Hoskins v Holland m d
Baillie Hamilton v Earl of Home c with wits
Wetherfield v Galindo c
Robinson v Arch c with wits
Vining v Ponsford m d
Richards v Roberts m d
Page v Pigeon m d
Cottell v Somerset & Dorset Ry Co c
Willis v Somerset & Dorset Ry Co c
Fielding v Rodda m d (short)
Haggis v Wallis c
Fox v Lownds m d
Goldring v Anker m d
Long v Jones m d
Long v Inskip m d
Minns v Pain m d
Palmer v Moore m d
Crozier v Calcott c with wits

End of Transfer.

Causes set down since Transfer.

Sargent v Moor m d (short)
Farrington v Foulkes m d
Harman v Stephenson f c
Pope v Eve f c
Bray v Tofield m d (short)
Howson v Trant f c (short)
Lees v Coulton rehing of m d
Birtles v Griffin f c
Curtis v Adams m d

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir RICHARD MALINS.

Causes.

Attorney-Gen v English m d pt hd
Macdougall v The Emma Silver Mining Co (limd) dem of the Co pt hd (S O)
Macdougall v The same Co dem of R. M. Gardiner and others pt hd (S O)
Doss v The Secretary of State for India in Council dem

Set down since commencement of Hilary Term, 1874 (exclusive of Transfers).

Thomson v Weston m d pt hd (S O)
Panama and South Pacific Telegraph Co v Same c with wits pt hd (Feb 10)
Harnett v Baker m d
Wellington v Taddy c with wits (Feb 16)
Gribble v Tucker m d and c pro confesso
Reuss v Barraclough m d
Philp v Botterell c with wits
Gibson v Hardy m d
Wilson v Maxfield c with wits

Set down since commencement of Trinity Term, 1874 (exclusive of Transfers).

McKewan v Sanderson m d (wits before exmnr)
Osborn v Osborn m d pt hd
Evans v Hopkins c with wits
Gray v Baker c with wits
Purcell v Cooper m d
Cotton v Weil m d
Beaumont v Emery m d
Rogers v Ange c
Quinton v Mayor, &c., of Bristol m d
Ramsden v Lister c with wits (re-transferred from V.C. Bacon by order)
In re James Gosman, of Clinton, Ontario, Canada pet of right
Poltick v Cheesman m d (revived)
Lyon v The Fishmongers' Co. m d
Bartlam v Yates m d (not before Feb 28)
Harvey v Harvey sp c
Spalding v Higgs c with wits
Page v Young f c
Fowler v Lang c
Jolliffe v Hayward c with wits (re-transferred from V.C. Bacon by order)
Andrew v Ensor m d
Haydon v Fox c
Osborn v Osborn c
Williams v Hiscox m d
Walker v Blake m d
Burrows v Williams m d (wits before exmnr)
Schofield v Jacomb m d (wits before exmnr)
Fielden v Gill m d
Smith v Pilgrim c with wits
Griffiths v Kennedy m d
Dowell v Wood m d
Hugo v Hugo m d
Wightwick v Barden m d
Hayne v Cavell c with wits
Cruse v Smith m d
Botterell v Horrell m d

Set down since commencement of Michaelmas Term, 1874 (exclusive of Transfer).

Godbold v Ellis c with wits
Scott v Laver m d (transferred from M. R. by order)
Rotherham, Masbro, & Holme Coal Co (limd) v Fullerton m d pt hd (Feb 11)
Phosphate Sewage Co (limd) v Hartmont c
Whitwill v Yeo f c
Willis v Clegg m d
Willats v Hooper f c
Mytton v Mytton m d
Townsend v Whieldon f c
Sullivan v Edgell Diamond v Edgell f c
Mayon v Hilliard m d
McIntosh v Watson f c

Set down since commencement of Hilary Term, 1875 (exclusive of Transfer).

Armstrong v Hall m d (set down at request of deft Hannah Armstrong)
Griffith v Hartmont c
Beddoes v The Bishop's Castle Ry Co m d (short)
Buchanan v Stanley m d
Kensit v Beswick m d
Reynard v Arnold m d
Caldicott v Smith Satchwell v Smith f c
Spickernell v Spickernell c
Roffey v Miller m d
Pilter v Barnes m d
Riminton v Paul f c
Ward v Pattison f c
Pigott v Stewart, knt m d
Sayce v Morgan c
Gow-Stewart v Bean f c
Montefiore v Gibbs c pro confesso (not before March 18)
Cook v Brutey f c
Moll v Harvey m d
Tuckfield v Edwards m d (sht)
Ibbotson v Jowett m d
Walker v Walker f c
Taylor v Garmeson m d (sht)
Benson v Newton m d

Thornton v Synnot m d
Sherborne v Watts m d (sht)
Hodgson v Hodgson m d (sht)
Hollick v Wilson f c
Seymer v Stanley m d
Sloper v Gattie Gattie v Sloper f c

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir JAMES BACON.

Causes set down previous to transfer.

Yardley v Holland m d (VCM) pt hd
Perkins v Jelf-Sharp dem of deft Vickers
Perkins v Jelf-Sharp dem of deft Matthews
Greg v Sager c with wits (Feb 16)
Job v Potton c with wits (VCM Feb 11)
Emanuel v Padwick c with wits (S O)
Wilson v Mersey Steel & Iron Co. m d (wits before exmnr)
Thursby v Thursby m d
Batley v Kynoch trial of question of fact before the court without a jury (Feb 19)

Remaining Causes transferred from the Book of the Vice-Chancellor Sir R. MALINS, by order dated December 4, 1874.

Turner v Moy m d pt hd
Sayers v Corrie m d (Feb 24)
Hodgkinson v Crowe m d
Thomas v Jones c (abated)
Couldery v Bradford m d
Wallwork v Sussum m d (wits before exmnr)
Churchill v Salisbury and Dorset Junction Ry Co m d
Whitbread v Flight m d
Whiting v Attenborrow m d
Wier v Tucker c with wits
Titcombe v Thain c, set down at request of defts F. J. Gill and anr (not before March 11)
Umfreville v Johnson c (not before Feb 15)
Marshall v Marden m d
Guedalla v Guedalla m d
Annesley v Hutton m d
Firth v The Midland Ry Co m d
Syers v Syers m d
Gibbs v Elworthy m d
Rose v Dormer m d
Hughes v True m d
Watkins v Powell c

End of Transfer.

Causes set down since Transfer.

Ashurst v Fowler c with wits
Ashurst v Mason c with wits
Gouldsmith v Luntley f c
Hickman v Plowright f c
Woodward v Woodward f c
Corrie v Sayers c with wits (transferred from V C M by order Feb 24)
Wagstaffe v Hill m d
Nicholson v Horsman m d
Attorney-Gen v Borough of Birmingham m d
Stansfield v Peate c
Fothergill v Richards m d
Hoffmann v Valle f c
Clarke v Adie m d
Thorp v Masterman m d
Jervis v Godden c
Lewis v Lewis f c
Bray v Stevens f c
Gullick v Tremlett m d
Whittaker v Whittaker sp c, restored by order
Atherton v De Castro f c
Mackett v Baylis rehing of m d

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir CHARLES HALL.

Causes.

British Mutual Investment Co (limd) v Smart dem
Burley v Tindall dem
Edwards v Thompson plea
Watson v Woodman m d (revived)
Wood v Saunders m d (Feb 16)
Republic of Peru v Ruzo m d
Heycock v Heycock c with wits and sums (Feb 10)
Bird v Freeman m d
Hinde v The Ystalyfera Iron Co m d (wits before exmnr)
Gurney v Dauglish c with wits (not before March 24)
Burkill v Matthews m d
Mayor &c of Oxford v Muir m d
Colliss v Hector m d
Jeyes v Prole m d (wits before exmnr)
Banks v Banks m d (S O)
Wilson v Gann m d (wits before exmnr)
Bevan v Price c with wits (Feb 15)
Stevens v King m d
Beswick v Baddley m d (wits before exmnr)
Attorney-Gen v Tunstall Local Board of Health m d
Harper v Bird c
Grace v Newman m d
Solkhon v Cavalier m d
Wilson v Johnstone f c
Billinge v Tunstall m d
Loveday v Chapman m d
Howard v Jervis c with wits (Feb 23)
Hanrott v Kirkman m d (wits before exmnr)
Wheeler v Roberts m d
Monckton v Monckton sp c
Cannon v Bliss c
King of Portugal v Carruthers m d & m
Finch v Hutton f c
Kelk v Douglas m d
Birkbeck v McCollah f c
Dingley v Wright m d pt hd (S O)
Crawford v Hill c
Holliday v Broadbent c with wits
Allen v Jackson m d
Chadwick v Chadwick f c with motn and sums (Feb 13)
Newman v Williams c
Tabor v Cunningham m d (wits before exmnr)
Wilson v Thomson c with wits
Munton v Morris m d (wits before exmnr)
Sykes v Mellor f c
Sillifant v Morgan m d
Hill v Crowther c
Llewelyn v David f c
Croysdill v Rickards m d
Pilkington v McKinnell f c
Dawes v Bagnall m d
Watkins v Nash m d with wits in court by order
Harness v Daws c
Powell v Luckes c, to be heard with Watkins v Nash by order
Harrison v Allen f c
Brookes v Watson m d
Scobell v Digby f c (not before March 2)
Nuttall v Cross f c
Montagu v Lord Inchiquin m d
Baylis v Abens m d (wits before exmnr)
Threlfall v Harrison m d
Myers v Moses m d
Parke v Thackray m d
Pearson v Nightingale f c
Puddicombe v Sparks f c & sums to vary
Yates v Finn m d
Jeyes v Savage m d
Porter v Porter m d
Brafield v Scriven f c (short)
Birch v Morgan m d set down at request of defts
Martin v Drew c
Martin v Scott m d
Mirehouse v Butterfield m d
Webster v Hindle c
Vero v McCallum f c
Burt v Hellyar f c (revived)
Morris v Hughes m d
Selby v Nation f c
Leman v Minter m d (1874—L—100 Feb 13)
Leman v Minter m d (1874—L—101 Feb 13)
Kingston v Lewer f c
Morris v Owen m d
Walshaw v Forcett m d
Harper v Brown f c
Phillips v Phillips f c
Boger v Pye sp c
Satterthwaite v Fisher m d
Tweddle v Lowe c
Craven v Ingram c (short)
Thornton v Hunt m d
Banks v Banks m d
Luckie v Cartwright c
Forrest v Gover m d

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Feb. 12, 1875.

3 per Cent. Consols, 93
Ditto for Account, Mar. 93⅛
3 per Cent. Reduced, 93⅜
New 3 per Cent., 92⅜
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73
Annuities, Jan. '80 —
Annuities, April, '85, 9⅛
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 1 pm.
Ditto, £500, Do 1 pm.
Ditto, £100 & £200, 1 pm.
Bank of England Stock, 5 per Ct. (last half-year), 257
Ditto for Account.

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	114
Stock	Caledonian	100	99
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	97
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	45
Stock	Great Northern	100	140
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	168
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	109
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	113
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	145
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	96 x d
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	24
Stock	London and North-Western	100	150⅜
Stock	London and South Western	100	116½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	78 x d
Stock	Metropolitan	100	84
Stock	Do., District	100	34
Stock	Midland	100	142
Stock	North British	100	70½
Stock	North Eastern	100	169½
Stock	North London	100	113
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	69
Stock	South Devon	100	98
Stock	South-Eastern	100	114¼ x d

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The bank rate continues 3 per cent. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has fallen from 43·12 per cent. last week to 42·68 per cent. this week. At the close of last week there was a fall in most of the leading home railway stocks, and on Monday the announcement of the dividend of the London and North-Western Railway at ¾ per cent. per annum lower than the corresponding period last year tended to depress the market. Prices improved on Tuesday and Wednesday, and the market was firm on Thursday. Business in the foreign market has been limited. Consols on Thursday closed 92⅞ to 3 for money and 93 to ⅛ for the account.

Messrs. Cummins & Chinnery will receive subscriptions for £300,000 being the entire issue of the first mortgage seven per cent. bonds of the Utica, Ithaca, and Elmira Railroad Company, in the State of New York, the price of issue being £175 per bond of £200, payments extending to July 1st, and bearing interest at the rate of £7 3s. 0d. per cent. payable in London each half year, and redeemable at par in 1902, the redemption being provided for by the operation of a sinking fund of £6,000 per annum, and accumulating interest, commencing in 1878. The prospectus states that the

railroad is "sixty-five miles in length, and runs in a north-easterly direction across the centre of the State of New York, between the Erie and New York Central Railways. It commences at Elmira and Corning, at which points it forms connections with the Northern Central Railroad and the Blossburg and Corning Railroad of Pennsylvania; proceeding eastwards it connects with the Pennsylvania and New York Division of the well-known Lehigh Valley Railroad, the Delaware, Lackawanna, and Western Railroad, and five other lines of minor importance which extend North and South between the parallel lines of the Erie and New York Central Roads." The share capital consists of two millions of dollars, of which 1,040,000 have been subscribed and fully paid, and Messrs. Haywards, Keele, & Swann, solicitors, of Frederick's Place, Old Jewry, certify that Mr. Swann has personally examined in America the property and organization of the company and the enactments governing the creation of this issue of bonds, and has satisfied himself that the issue is in conformity with the laws of the State of New York and of the United States, and that the bonds form a first charge on all the property of the railroad company. The subscription lists open on Monday nd close on Thursday the 18th inst.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

EVERINGTON—Feb. 9, at Merton House, Dulwich-wood-park, the wife of E. R. Everington, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

HALL—Feb. 3, at Sydenham-place, Longsight, Manchester, the wife of Charles J. Hall, solicitor, of a son.

HUGHES—Feb. 1, at Marine-terrace, Aberystwith, the wife of Arthur J. Hughes, Esq., solicitor, of a son.

KIRBY—Feb. 3, at 10, Tavistock-road, Westbourne-park, the wife of Thomas Frederick Kirby, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

GLEN—READE—Feb. 4, at St. Mary Abbotts, Kensington, Alexander Glen, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, to Florence Lucy, youngest daughter of the Rev. C. Darby Reade, M.A., of 83, Holland-road, Kensington.

DEATHS.

CHRISTIE—Feb. 2, at Bournemouth, James Traill Christie, Esq., barrister-at-law, aged 51.

HESTER—Feb. 7, at St. Aldate's-street, Oxford, Frederic Hester, solicitor, aged 33.

JEFFERY—Feb. 4, at Mentone, Charles Jeffery, district court judge, Jamaica, aged 36.

MALLOCK—Feb. 6, at Weston-super-Mare, Charles Herbert Mallock, Esq., of Cockington Court, Torquay, J.P. for Devon, aged 34.

STIGANT—Jan. 29, at Portland-place, Southsea, G. C. Stigant, Esq., J.P., solicitor, aged 75.

WRIGHT—Feb. 4, at 10, Rutland-park, Perry-hill, James Wright, Esq., of 8, New-inn, Strand, aged 71.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Feb. 9, 1875.

Girling, John Arthur, and Eustace William Owles, Attorneys, Chancery lane. Jan 30

Tucker, Samuel Ward, Francis Charles New, and Arthur Langdale, Solicitors, King st, Cheapside. Dec 15

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, Feb. 9, 1875.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Llandaff and Canton District Market Company.—Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Courtenay Clarke, Crockherbtown, Cardiff. Thursday, March 18, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

FRIDAY, Feb. 5, 1875.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Anglo-German Marezzo Marble Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Jan 27, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Norman, Old Bond st, solicitor for the petitioners.

Battersea Foundry and Horse Shoe Works, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Jan 29, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Diggles, Borough High st, London bridge, solicitor for the petitioners.

Joseph Suche and Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Jan 30, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Tatham and Son, Old Broad st, solicitors for the petitioner.

London Cotton Mills, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 3, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on Feb 19. Learoyd and Co, Chancery lane, solicitors for the petitioners.

Steam Stoker Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 2, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon on Feb 13. Pulbrook, Threadneedle st, solicitor for the petitioner.

Vimenet and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 1, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Feb 13. Raven and Curtis, Victoria st, solicitors for the petitioners.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

Morvah Consols Tin Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 30, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden, at the Law Institution, Chancery lane, on Saturday, Feb 13, at 12. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the registrar's office, Truro, on or before Feb 10, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioner, his solicitors or his agents. Carlyon and Paull, Truro, agents for Trinder, Bishopsgate st within, solicitor for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, Feb. 9, 1875.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Cagliari Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Jan 29, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Kimber and Lee, Queen st, Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioner.

Catherine and Jane Lead Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Jan 30, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Watson and Sons, Bouverie st, solicitors for the petitioner.

Common Road Conveyance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 4, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on Feb 19. Tocque, Aldermanbury, solicitor for the petitioners.

Flour Mill Colliery Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before March 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Hugh Stanton, Cannon st. Thursday, March 18, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Hart's Pure Whole Meal Bread and Biscuit Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Jan 30, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Taylor and Sons, Field court, solicitors for the petitioner.

Llangennech Collieries Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before March 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Augustus Cape and John Luttman, Old Jewry. Friday, April 9, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Shanklin Madeira Hotel Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, by an order, dated Jan 16, appointed Henry Abbey, Lincoln's inn fields, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Feb 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Wednesday, March 10, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Tepilta Colliery and Coal Oil Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Jan 30, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Bailey, Tokenhouse yard, solicitor for the petitioners

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Feb. 5, 1875.

Blagg, Thomas Ward, St Albans, Herts, Gent. March 15. Merriman v Blagg, V.C. Hall. Burder and Dunning, Parliament st, Westminster

Casse, Ann Abigail, St John's wood place, Regent's park. March 2. Idle v Rawlinson, M.R. Collinson, Bedford row

Griffin, William, Stockton fields, Warwick, Farmer. March 8. Griffin v Griffin, M.R. Welchman, Southam

Loe, George, Portsmouth, Coach Builder. March 5. Loe v Loe, V.C. Hall. Hellard, Portsmouth

Tomlin, Reuben, Shelford Lodge, Nottingham, Farmer. March 15. Cleaver v Tomlin, V.C. Hall. Richards, Nottingham

TUESDAY, Feb. 9, 1875.

Anderson, Frances, Worthing, Sussex. March 25. Smith v Baker, V.C. Malins. Edmunds, Worthing

Cunliffe, Sarah, Elm Tree Lodge, Finchley. March 6. Cunliffe v Cunliffe, V.C. Hall. Chapple, Queen st, Cheapside

Hall, John, London rd, Southwark, Glass Merchant. March 10. Hall v Murphy, M.R. Marson and Dadley, Southwark bridge rd

Hedges, Edward, Stewkley, Buckingham, Farmer. March 15. Capel v Barton, V.C. Hall. Willis, Leighton Buzzard

King, William Wallis, Bournemouth, Hants, Esq. March 10. Washbourn v King, V.C. Malins. Quekett, Lincoln's inn fields

Lemon, Edwin, Purse Caundle, Dorset, Yeoman. March 5. Dingley v Lemon, V.C. Hall. Norton, King st, Cheapside

Miller, James, Lymington, Hants, Nurseryman. March 1. Wrench v Miller, V.C. Hall. Coxwell, Lymington

Sainsbury, George, Bath Easton, Somerset, Gent. March 1. Hales v Sainsbury, V.C. Hall. Gribble, Bristol

Twitchin, John, St Thomas the Apostle, Devon, Builder. Feb 24. Twitchin v Ellis, V.C. Bacon. Campion, Exeter

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Feb 5, 1875.

Adames, Benness, Chichester, Esq. March 25. Arnold, Chichester

Baker, Joseph, Ratby, Leicestershire, Gent. March 31. Harris, Leicester

Barnes, Edward, Leyland, Lancashire, Surgeon. March 15. Turner and Son, Preston

Burgoyne, Frederick, Charles st, St. James', Colonel. March 15. Ward and Co, Gray's inn sq

Colthurst, Robert Thomas Trivett, Thurloxton, Somerset, Gent. March 15. Ruddock and Auber, Bridgewater, Somerset

Davies, Mary, Dolver, Montgomery, Innkeeper. March 1. Woosnam and Talbot, Newtown

Ellis, George, King's rd, Clapham park, Esq. March 1. Langley Charlotte st, Bedford square

Field, Charles Frederick, Stanley villas, West Brompton. March 1. Gill, Cheapside

Haber, Ludwig, Breslau, Germany, Vice Consul. April 30. Fielder and Sumner, Godliman st, Doctor's commons

Harris, Thomas, Hugglescote, Leicester, Farmer. March 8. Smith and Mammatt, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
Harvard, Arsene, Leeds, Teacher of Languages. March 31. Snowden, Leeds
Heppell, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Brass Founder. March 31. Chartres and Youll, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Hill, John, Spaldhurst rd, Hackney, Draper's Clerk. March 1. Plunkett, Gutter lane
Hutchinson, Richard, Birkdale, Lancashire, Wool Stapler. March 20 Jackson, Rochdale
Irwin, Edward, Leeds, Esq. May 13. North and Sons, Leeds
Kierman, Francis, Manchester st, Manchester square, Surgeon. March 1. Dixon and Co, Bedford row
Letts, James, Hollowell, Northampton, Farmer. March 23. Jeffery, Northampton
Lush, John Lampard, Warminster, Wiltshire, Grocer. March 1. Clara Lush, Market place, Warminster
Millard, James, Lindley, Old Brentford, Lighterman. March 8. Ruston and Co, Brentford
Munro, Robert, Wugurabad, East Indies, Sub-Engineer. March 15. Batten, Great George st, Westminster
Parker, Walter, Rendlesham rd, Clapton, Packing Case Maker. April 5. Francis Hunson, Shrubland grove, Dalston
Pemell, Harriett Lydia, Canterbury. Feb 28. Prior and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Philpot, John, Great Ilford, Essex, Corn Merchant. March 25. Baddeley and Sons, Leman st, Goodman's fields
Richardson, Anne, Westbourne park villas. March 9. Taylor and Co, Great James st, Bedford row
Solman, William Sidery, Manchester st, Gray's inn rd, Cab Proprietor. March 1. Dixon and Co, Bedford row
Stokes, Elizabeth, Leacroft, Staffordshire. March 25. Barnes and Russell, Lichfield
Thomas, Henry Harington, Bath, Esq. March 25. Norton and Co, Victoria st, Westminster Abbey
Webb, James Alden, Barnsbury square, Islington, Gent. Feb 27. Fuller, Rugby
Williams, Mary, New Quebec st, Portman square. March 5. Gregory, King st, Cheapside
Woodall, Robert, Manchester, Gent. March 25. Baker, Manchester
Wreen, James, Catsfield, Sussex, Farmer. April 30. Raper and Ellman, Battle

TUESDAY, Feb. 9, 1875.

Alo, Nicholas Sweetapple, Northampton rd, Clerkenwell, Gold and Silver Chaser. March 7. Worthington and Co, Coleman st
Aveline, Thomas, Epsom, Surrey, Solicitor. March 10. Park and Co, Essex st, Strand
Blackstone, Joseph, Gloucester rd, Regent's park, Surgeon. April 5. Hughes, Chapel st, Bedford row
Brookes, Simon, Pendleton, Lancashire, Gent. March 25. Weston and Co, Manchester
Budgen, Friend, Barcombe, Sussex, Farmer. April 5. Hillman, Lewes
Cope, Frederick, Kennington park rd, Wine Cooper. March 4. Lidiard, High st, Clapham
Gilbert, Rev George, Little Gonerby, Lincoln. May 1. Thompson and Sons, Grantham
Graham, John, Charles st, St. James's square, Gent. April 10. Pawle and Co, New inn, Strand
Hamber, Thomas, Park rd, New Wandsworth, Gent. March 25. Corsellis, East hill, Wandsworth
Hart, Jacob, Victoria terrace, Bridge rd, Battersea, Gent. March 25. Corsellis, East hill, Wandsworth
Hawks, George Henry Longridge, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Gent. March 1. Keenlyside and Forster, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Heffer, Henry, Long Acre, Coach Builder. March 31. May, Russell square
Honey, Charles Frederick, Richmond rd, Barnsbury, Gent. March 10. Sturt, Ironmonger lane
Hunter, William, Llanidloes, Montgomery, Lieut Colonel. March 22. Johnson and Master, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane
Leigh, Robert, Worsley, Lancashire, Gent. March 25. Weston and Co, Manchester
Mack, William, Manchester, Secretary. March 25. Griffin, Birmingham
Mason, Elizabeth, Wimbledon, Surrey. March 10. Sturt, Ironmonger lane
Odell, William, Ledsham, Cheshire, Estate Agent. March 1. Richardson and Co, Liverpool
Preston, Algernon Edward Sheppard, Milnthorpe, Westmoreland, Captain. March 23. Bootys and Bayliffe, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn
Prieggen, William, Grove terrace, Mile End, Foreman. March 4. Ashwin, Garden court, Temple
Prince, John, Albion villas, Hammersmith, Gent. March 5. Watson and Sons, Bridge rd, Hammersmith
Rees, Josiah, Morriston, Glamorganshire, Chemical Manufacturer. March 17. Davies and Hartland, Swansea
Richardson, John, Spencer rd, Battersea, Gent. March 25. Corsellis, East hill, Wandsworth
Seemann, Carl Berthold, Westminster chambers, Victoria st, Esq. April 30. Fielder and Sumner, Godliman st, Doctors' commons
Stevenson, Michael, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Coach Builder. March 13. Abbott, Leamington
Taylor, Israel, Orrell, Lancashire, Gent. March 20. Leigh and Ellis, Wigan
Wadeson, William, Old Broad st, Stock Broker. March 25. Reyroux and Co, Cannon st
Walters, Andrew, Gloucester, Grocer. March 13. Wiltons and Riddiford, Gloucester
Walton, James, Sunderland, Durham, Gent. March 30. Lietch and Co, North Shields
Ward, Edward, Nottingham, Agent. March 10. Acton, Nottingham
Wood, John Partridge, Court Less, Kent, Gent. April 6. Plummer and Fielding, Canterbury
Young, George, Munster House, Fulham, Retired Captain. March 9. Wadeson and Malleson, Austin friars

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Feb. 5, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Coape, Capel, Church st, Fulham, Colonel of Militia. Pet Feb 1. Brougham. Feb 19 at 11
Jacobs, Sidney, Camberwell New rd, Gent. Pet Sept 17. Spring-Rice. Feb 25 at 11
Partridge, Joseph Roby, Great Winchester st. Pet Feb 2. Hazlitt. Feb 16 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Cerexhe, Victor, Acton, Middlesex, Teacher of Languages. Pet Jan 7. Ruston. Brentford, Feb 23 at 3

TUESDAY, Feb. 9, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Stephens, Josias, Stephen's terrace, Notting hill, Builder. Pet Feb 6. Pepys. Feb 23 at 11
Tooth, W H , sen, Sewardstone rd, Victoria park, and W H Tooth, jun, Bouverie rd, Church st, Stoke Newington, Brick Manufacturers. Pet Feb 4. Pepys. Feb 23 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Brooke, Joseph, Staincliffe, York, Rag Merchant. Pet Feb 4. Nelson. Dewsbury, Feb 25 at 12
Caldecott, Robert, Manchester, Estate Broker. Pet Feb 4. Kay. Manchester, Feb 19 at 9.30
Hopkinson, William, East Retford, Nottingham, Fruit Salesman. Pet Feb 5. Uppleby. Lincoln. Feb 22 at 12
Thornton, Henry, Liverpool, Grocer. Pet Feb 4. Watson. Liverpool, Feb 18 at 2
Warren, Alfred, Luton, Dunstable, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Pet Feb 5. Austin. Luton, Feb 23 at 12.30
Warren, Alfred, and William Lenton, Luton, Bedford, Hat Manufacturers. Pet Feb 1. Austin. Luton, Feb 23 at 12.30

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Feb. 5, 1875.

Myer, Henry, Englefield rd, Islington, Diamond Dealer. Feb 3

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 5, 1875.

Abraham, Joseph, Bristol, Glazier. Feb 16 at 2 at offices of Buckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
Allatt, Joseph, and Joseph Allatt, jun, Littletown, Birstal, York, Cart Manufacturers. Feb 19 at 3 at offices of Chadwick and Sons, Church st, Dewsbury
Allen, Thomas, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Outfitter. Feb 18 at 2 at 145, Cheapside. Fardell and Wooldridge, Ventnor
Atherley, Henry Mark, Hove, Sussex, Lieutenant in H.M.'s 93rd Regiment. Feb 20 at 1 at offices of Clennell and Fraser, Great James st, Bedford row
Backhouse, Mary Ann, Manchester st, Manchester square, Boarding House Keeper. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Kent, Red Lion court, Cannon st
Bartlett, John, West Cowes, Isle of Wight, Bootmaker. March 1 at 3 at the George Hotel, High st, West Cowes. Hooper
Beck, Eden, Gray's inn rd, Chair Manufacturer. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Norris, Great James st, Bedford row
Berry, Henry, New rd, Hammersmith, Licensed Victualler. Feb 18 at 2 at the London Joint Stock Bank chambers, West Smithfield. Hubbard
Bishop, James, New Swindon, Wilts, House Decorator. Feb 17 at 12 at 42, Cricklade st, Swindon. Wilton
Blackston, Herman, Leeds, Commercial Traveller. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
Bliss, William, Northampton, Baker. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Becke, Market square, Northampton
Blyth, Elizabeth Lucy, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey, Milliner. Feb 18 at 3 at offices of Sherrard, Lincoln's inn fields
Brander, Edwyn Vancy, Sutton, Surrey, Gent. Feb 22 at 1 at offices of Fletcher and Co, Moorgate st. Lyne and Holman, Great Winchester st
Brander, William Reade, Eltham, Kent, Managing Director. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Fletcher and Co, Moorgate st. Lyne and Holman, Great Winchester st
Brightman, Edward Richard, Queenborough, Kent, Baker. Feb 16 at 11 at offices of Mole, Edward st, Sheerness
Brine, David, Bradford, York, Fruit Salesman. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrrel st, Bradford
Carter, Wilfred, David John Tyrer, and Robert Parker, Liverpool, Timber Merchants. Feb 24 at 2.30 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Phipps, Liverpool
Chappell, Joseph, Luna st, Chelsea, Builder. Feb 17 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Oldham, Serjeant's inn, Chancery lane
Clayton, Thomas, Preston, Lancashire, Joiner. Feb 20 at 2 at offices of Forshaw, Cannon st, Preston
Clayton, William, Wigan, Lancashire, Commission Agent. Feb 18 at 11 at offices of Wilson, King st, Wigan
Comber, William, Guildford, Surrey, Innkeeper. Feb 15 at 3 at the Three Pigeons Inn, Guildford. Durbidge, Guildford
Crawley, Young, Cambridge, Carriage Builder. Feb 18 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, St Andrew's st, Cambridge. Ellison and Burrows, Cambridge
Crighton, Duncan, Manchester, Engineer. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Kershaw, Booth st, Manchester
Davies, Hugh, Liverpool, Timber Merchant. Feb 23 at 2 at offices of Jones, Harrington st, Liverpool
Davis, James, Birmingham, Glass Dealer. Feb 17 at 12 at offices of Southall and Co, Newhall st, Birmingham
Davison, John, Sunderland, Innkeeper. Feb 13 at 11 at offices of Fairclough, West Sunniside, Sunderland
De Caville, Henry, Seagrave rd, West Brompton, Licensed Victualler. Feb 19 at 3 at offices of Buckler and Co, Fenchurch st
Dixon, Ann, Leeds, Dyers. Feb 16 at 2 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
Edmonds, James, Globe rd, Mile End rd, Mineral Water Manufacturer. Feb 18 at 2 at offices of Sydney, Leadenhall st

Eisdberg, Joseph, High st, Camden town, Tailor. Feb 17 at 11 at offices of Sidney, Lincoln's inn fields

Faber, Louis, Rood lane, Wine Merchant. Feb 17 at 2 at Kennan's Hotel, Crown court, Cheapside. Nash and Co, Queen st

Fletcher, James, Ovenden, York, Mason. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Horton st. Halifax

Gibbon, John, South Shields, Durham, Sailmaker. Feb 15 at 2 at offices of Tinley and Co, Howard st, North Shields

Grundy, William, Matlock, Derby, Grocer. Feb 23 at 2 at offices of Gretton. Corn market, Derby

Gulliver, Charles Miles, and Robert Henry Bickell, Oxford st, Tailors. Feb 18 at 11 at offices of Anderson and Sons, Ironmonger lane

Hazel, James, jun, Sherrall park, Stafford, Farmer. Feb 17 at 11 at the Castle Hotel, Tamworth. Baker, Birmingham

Harris, John, Stretton-upon-Dunsmore, Warwick, Farmer. Feb 19 at 11 at the Crown Hotel, Leamington. Kilby and Co, Banbury

Haworth, Matthew, and John Worsick, Ramsbottom, Lancashire, Waste Spinners. Feb 24 at 3 at offices of Rylance, Essex st, Manchester

Hawzwell, Samuel, Sowerby, York, Painter. Feb 18 at 11 at offices of West, Market place, Thirsk

Hepworth, James, Oldham, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. Feb 18 at 3 at offices of Buckley and Clegg, Clegg st, Oldham

Hodson, John, Birmingham, Warehouseman. Feb 19 at 1 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson place, Birmingham. Reece and Harris, Birmingham

Horrocks, Joseph, Bradford, York, Picker Maker. Feb 9 at 10 at offices of Wood and Killick, Commercial Bank buildings, Bradford

Hoyle, David, Bootle, Lancashire, out of business. Feb 24 at 1 at offices of Quelch, Dale st, Liverpool

Hunt, Henry Thomas, Commercial rd east, Licensed Victualler. Feb 15 at 11 at the Victoria Tavern, Morpeth rd, Bethnal green. Long, Landsdown terrace, Grove rd, Victoria park

Jackson, Robert John, Willington, Durham, Porter Merchant. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Brignall, jun, Saddler st, Durham

James, David, Bryncapel, Carmarthen, Farmer. Feb 15 at 12 at the Cawdor's Arms, Llandile

Jeffrey, Russell, Birmingham, Ironfounder. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Glaisyer, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Jones, David, Connah's quay, Flint, Ship Builder Feb 20 at 11.30 at the Blossoms Hotel, Foregate st, Cheshire. Lockett, Liverpool

Jones, John, Sandbach, Cheshire, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 19 at 2 at the Crewe Arms Hotel, Crewe. Bygott, Sandbach

Kent, John, Hanley, Stafford, Grocer. Feb 8 at 10.30 at the Vine Inn, Stafford. Shires, Leicester

Lamb, Leopold George, Walworth rd, Schoolmaster. Feb 13 at 12 at Rider's Hotel, Holborn

Lazarus, Moss, High st, Camden town, Clothier. Feb 17 at 2 at offices of Barnett, New Broad st

Leach, Daniel Joseph. City rd, Islington, Pianoforte String Manufacturer. March 1 at 3 at offices of Montagu, Bucklersbury

Littlewood, Benjamin, Hyde, Cheshire, Farm Labourer. Feb 19 at 3 at offices of Smith, Hyde

Lodge, Frederick John, Clydach, Brecon, Draper. Feb 18 at 1 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Linton and Williams, Aberdare

Lowe, Mary Elizabeth, Middlesborough, York, Dressmaker. Feb 16 at 11 at Barker's Temperance Hotel, Bridge st west, Middlesborough

Maberly, Alfred William, Exeter Hall, Strand, Architect. Feb 26 at 10.30 at offices of Haydon, New City chambers, Bishopsgate st within. Gucotte and Co, Bishopsgate st within

Macpherson, Macduff Munroe, Brighton, Sussex, Private Tutor. Feb 27 at 3 at the Telemachus Room, Old Ship Hotel, Brighton. Lamb, Brighton

Martin, Andrew, Stone, Stafford, Innkeeper. Feb 19 at 11 at the King's Arms, High st, Stone. Tennant, Hanley

Mallo, George, Highworth, Wilts, Horse Dealer. Feb 16 at 12 at 42, Cricklard st, Swindon. Wilton

Meade, Arthur Tom, Weymouth, Dorset, Corn Merchant. Feb 19 at 11 at offices of Hanne, Upper Bond st, Weymouth

Munkley, George, Blaina, Monmouth, Collier. Feb 19 at 12 at offices of Shepard, Beaufort st, Brynmawr

Myers, John David, Great St Helen's, Commission Merchant. Feb 17 at 4 at offices of Parker and Locke, Pavement, Finsbury

Myers, Morris, Euston rd, Wire Worker. Feb 19 at 12 at offices of Sydney, Leadenhall st

Norton, Alfred, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Tobacco Merchant. Feb 15 at 12 at offices of Gamble and Harvey, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Stanley, Norwich

Parr, Henry, Burnham, Somerset, Innkeeper. Feb 18 at 12 at offices of Brice and Bloch, Victoria st, Burnham

Pike, Thomas, Runcorn, Cheshire, Auctioneer. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Ashton and Garratt, High st, Runcorn

Pottage, George Henry William, Jermyn st, Clerk. Feb 13 at 11 at offices of Willis, St Martin's court, Leicester square

Pratt, Richard, Norwich, Horse Trainer. Feb 15 at 12 at the County Court, Redwell st, Norwich

Robinson, William, Sunderland, Durham, Grocer. Feb 17 at 12 at offices of Moore, John st, Sunderland

Roscoe, Charles, Stalybridge, Cheshire, Poulterer. Feb 18 at 11 at the King Richard the Third Inn, High st, Manchester. Whitehead, Stalybridge

Russell, John, Liverpool, Draper. Feb 17 at 8, York st, Manchester, in lieu of the place originally named

Satterthwaite, Sarah, Willenhall, Stafford, Fish Dealer. Feb 18 at 11 at offices of Baker, Walsall st, Willenhall

Scott, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, Draper. Feb 19 at 12 at offices of Spurr, Scale lane, Kingston-upon-Hull

Sheimerdine, Thomas, Manchester, Tailor. Feb 19 at 11 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester

Sotiriades, Demetrius, Liverpool, Oriental Confectioner. Feb 17 at 12 at offices of Parkinson, Lord st, Liverpool

Stuart, William Edward, Guildford, Surrey, Painter. Feb 18 at 3 at the County and Borough Hall, Guildford. Geach, Guildford

Syms, Francis, Salisbury, Wilts, Carver. Feb 22 at 3 at the Market House, Salisbury. Hodding

Tooley, Alfred William, Dunstable, Bedford, Corn Merchant. Feb 16 at 12 at the Green Dragon Hotel, Bishopsgate st within. Armstrong, Hertford

Wainwright, Peter, St Helen's, Lancashire, Innkeeper. Feb 19 at 2 at offices of Lupton, Harrington st, Liverpool

Ward, John, and Robert Ward, Manchester, Cotton Spinners. Feb 24 at 11 at offices of Dowling, Wood st, Bolton

Warren, Alfred, Dunstable, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Feb 16 at 2 at the George Hotel, Luton. Sole and Co, Aldermanbury

Waters, Watkin, Pontrypridd, Collier. Feb 22 at 12 at the Post Office chambers, Pontrypridd. Rosser, Aberdare

Westoby, John, Huddersfield, York, Clogger. Feb 27 at 2 at the White Swan Hotel, Huddersfield. Freeman, Huddersfield

Wilde, Alfred William, and Joe Thomas Wilde, Ecclesfield, York, Gannister Manufacturers. Feb 15 at 11 at offices of Rodgers and Co, Bank st, Sheffield

Wilson, John Charles, Liverpool, Draper. Feb 23 at 3 at offices of Love, Castle st, Liverpool

TUESDAY, Feb. 9, 1875.

Arnold, Fanny, Appleby Magna, Leicester, Shopkeeper. Feb 27 at 3 at the Shoulder of Mutton Inn, Market st, Ashby-de-la-Zouch. Wilton, Burton-on-Trent

Beard, Joseph, Dudley, Worcester, Draper. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of of Lowe, Temple st, Birmingham

Bell, George, Wellington, Salop, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 24 at 1 at offices of Cooper, Listley st, Brierley hill

Bennett, William Henry, Walsall, Stafford, Grocer. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Crump, Bridge st, Walsall

Bensted, Owen Richard, Kew rd, Richmond, Builder. Feb 23 at 3 at offices of Wood and Hare, Basinghall st

Blakey, William, Heworth, York, Commercial Traveller. Feb 19 at 11 at offices of Watson, Lendal, York

Bryan, John, Bristol, Boot Factor. Feb 24 at 2 at offices of Tricks and Co, City chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol. Jury, Bristol

Burling, Charles Willoughby, and William John Williamson, Middlesborough, York, Grocers. Feb 22 at 11 at Barker's Temperance Hotel, Bridge st west, Middlesborough. Bainbridge, Middlesborough

Carrall, Henry, Scarborough, York, Toy Dealer. Feb 12 at 12 at offices of Pitman and Lane, Nicholas lane, Lombard st. Williamson, Scarborough

Chapman, William, Rothwell, Northampton, Hairdresser. Feb 22 at 11 at offices of Preedy, Gas st, Kettering

Charlesworth, Daniel, Buglawton, Cheshire, Joiner. Feb 24 at 3 at the Lion and Swan Hotel, Congleton. Garside

Collingbourne, Henry, Stoneleigh, Warwick, Glazier. Feb 22 at 2 at the County Court Office, Little Park st, Coventry. Homer, Coventry

Collins, Walter, Chesham, Buckingham, Dealer. Feb 22 at 11 at offices of Cheese, High st, Chesham

Cripwell, James, Smethwick, Stafford, Canal Carrier. Feb 19 at 3 at offices of Travis, Church lane, Tipton

Carnock, John, Ledbury, Hereford. out of business. Feb 25 at 1 at offices of Clutterbuck, High st, Worcester

Dando, William Elbert, Regent st, Manager of a Public Company. Feb 18 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Mayhew, Walbrook

Dash, William, and Isaac Bateman, Two Mile hill, Gloucester, Boot Manufacturers. Feb 20 at 11 at offices of Essery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol

Dawson, George William, Norwich, Licensed Victualler. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Sadd and Linays, Church st, Theatre st, Norwich

Deve, George Hastings Rust, Watton, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb 22 at 2 at offices of Grigson and Robinson, Watton

Duckworth, William, Bury, Lancashire, Pork Butcher. Feb 23 at 3 at offices of Anderton, Garden st, Bury

Edwards, Henry, Swansea, Glamorgan, Grocer. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Woodward, Wind st, Swansea

Escritt, Jane, Great Driffield, York, Seed Dealer. Feb 22 at 11 at offices of White, Exchange st, Great Driffield

Fletcher, James Smallwood, Preston, Lancashire, Jeweller. Feb 24 at 2 at offices of Taylor, Winckley st, Preston

Fox, Charles Frederick, Stretton-under-Fosse, Warwick, Builder. Feb 26 at 12 at the Bull Hotel, Nuneaton. Slingsby, Nuneaton

French, George, Bilston, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Bowen, Mount Pleasant, Bilston

Friedlander, Henry Lesser, Bartlett's buildings, Holborn, Importer of Tobacconists' Fancy Goods. Feb 25 at 2 at offices of Sydney and Son, Finsbury circus

Ganderton, Ellen, Kingston-upon-Hull, Milliner. Feb 18 at 3 at offices of Laverack, County buildings, Kingston-upon-Hull

Garth, James, Pudsey, York, Tinner. Feb 19 at 11 at the Commercial Hotel, Albion st, Leeds. Wooler

Gregory, George, Leicester, Shoe Manufacturer. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Pocklington's walk, Leicester

Hands, James, Wallingford, Berks, General Dealer. Feb 26 at 2 at 28, Pembroke st, Oxford. Cooper, Charing cross

Haymes, Robert Barrett, Wellington st, Strand, Tobacconist. March 1 at 2 at offices of Gowing, Coleman st

Holroyd, John Jackson, Leeds, Druggist. Feb 22 at 2 at the Queen Hotel, Wellington st, Leeds. Milnes

Hurley, David, Burslem, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Feb 18 at 3 at the Mason's Arms Inn, Burslem. Tompkinson, Burslem

James, David, Swansea, Glamorgan, Blacksmith. Feb 20 at 3.30 at 98, Mansel st, Swansea. Leyson, Neath

Jones, Ebenezar, and Henry Jones, Cwmcarne, Monmouth, General Shop Keepers. Feb 12 at 1 at offices of Lloyd, Bank chambers, Newport

Judson, Charles, Halifax, York, Scale Maker. Feb 22 at 3 at the Talbot Hotel, Halifax. Leeming, Halifax

Lashford, Edward, Tockington, Gloucester, Grocer. Feb 19 at 1 at offices of Miller, Whitson chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol

Liddell, John, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Drapers' Assistant. Feb 23 at 12 at offices of Lumb and Howson, Queen st, Whitehaven

Lighton, Agnes Follett, Paignton, Devon. Feb 22 at 11 at offices of Hirtzell, Queen st, Exeter

Ling, Samuel, Yeoman's terrace, Lower rd, Rotherhithe, Coal Merchant. Feb 17 at 4 at offices of Young and Sons, Mark lane

Malpas, William, Ramsey, Essex, Farmer. March 1 at 1 at the Railway Hotel, Manningtree. Smith

Manfield, William, Thirkleby, York, Farmer. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Arrowsmith and Richardson, Castlegate, Thirsk

Mays, William Ayres, Birmingham, out of business. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Saunders and Bradbury, Temple row, Birmingham

Mitchell, Benjamin, sen, Denver, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb 19 at 12 at offices of Beloe, New Conduit st, King's Lynn
Moody, Thomas William, Ryhope, Durham, Ale Merchant. March 1 at 11 at offices of Oliver and Botterell, John st, Sunderland
Morgans, Benjamin, Neyland, Pembroke, Stone Mason. Feb 27 at 10.30 at the Guildhall, Carmarthen. Parry, Pembroke Dock
Morgan, Richard, Blaenavon, Monmouth, Ironmonger. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Watkins, Pontypool
Morris, John, Pembroke, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 25 at 12 at offices of Nunneley, Nicholas st, Bristol
Morris, William, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Ironmonger. Feb 20 at 11 at offices of Jessop, Church st, Cheltenham
Nance, Frederick Hutchings, Southsea, Hants, Law Stationer. Feb 27 at 2 at offices of Reed, Union st, Portsea
Nevison, Jane, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Grocer. Feb 19 at 11.30 at Labron's Commercial Hotel, Market place, Bishop Auckland. Proud, Bishop Auckland
Newman, George, Harrington rd, South Norwood, Commercial Traveller. Feb 24 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Parry, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st
O'Brien, Patrick, Liverpool, Cart Owner. Feb 25 at 12 at offices of Carruthers, Clayton square, Liverpool
Patterson, Henry, Newport, Monmouth. Draper. Feb 23 at 1 at offices of Lloyd, Bank chambers, Newport
Patterson, Robert, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Cabinet Maker. Feb 23 at 11 at offices of Dunlop, Quay walls, Berwick-upon-Tweed
Pearson, Barnabas, Brierley hill, Stafford, out of business. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Waldrop, High st, Brierley hill
Peterson, Cornelius George, Bristol, out of business. Feb 16 at 1 at offices of Clifton, Corn st, Bristol
Phillips, Philip, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. Feb 18 at 12 at offices of Beddoe, Canon st, Aberdare
Phillips, Thomas, Ebbw Vale, Monmouth, Grocer. Feb 15 at 12 at 39, Broad st, Bristol, in lieu of the place and time originally named
Poole, Joseph, Crampmoor, Hants, Timber Dealer. Feb 18 at 2 at offices of Killby, Portland st, Southampton
Purcell, Joseph, Manchester, Boot Maker. Feb 23 at 2 at offices of Chew and Sons, Swan st, Manchester
Quinn, Edward John, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Feb 18 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton
Rawlings, Mary Elizabeth, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Milliner. Feb 19 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Forster, Grainger st west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Reynolds, William Isaac, Upper Ground st, Blackfriars rd, Plumber. Feb 24 at 11 at 3, Wansey st, Walworth rd
Riley, William, London rd, Southwark, Dealer in Paper Hangings. Feb 22 at 11 at offices of Blake and Snow, College hill, Cannon st
Ritchie, John, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Travelling Draper. Feb 18 at 12 at offices of Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme
Rowley, George William, Foster lane, Cheapside, Fringe Manufacturer. Feb 22 at 11 at offices of Roberts, Coleman st
Royle, Thomas, Foot's Cray, Kent, Calico Printer. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Bell and Crowder, Victoria buildings, Queen Victoria st
Shynman, Samuel, Tredegar, Brecon, Furniture Dealer. Feb 23 at 11 at 18, High st, Cardiff. Morgan
Size, Reuben Christopher Sebastian, Birmingham, Cabinet Maker. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Hawkes, Temple st, Birmingham
Smith, Harry, Swadincote, Derby, Builder. Feb 24 at 3 at the White Hart Hotel, Burton-upon-Trent. Harvey, Leicester
Smith, Henry James, Handsworth, Stafford, Die Sinker. Feb 19 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham
Stebbings, Benjamin, Norwich, Japanner. Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Emerson and Sparrow, Rampant Horse st, Norwich
Stokoe, William, Middlesborough, York, Grocer. Feb 19 at 3 at offices of Draper, Stockton-on-Tees
Thompson, Frederick Lunn, Gateshead, Durham, Accountant. Feb 18 at 2 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Thorne, Thomas Warner, Neyland, Pembroke, Grocer. Feb 20 at 10.30 at the Guildhall, Carmarthen. Parry, Pembroke Dock
Treadgold, John George, Dorrington st, Clerkenwell, Tea Urn Manufacturer. Feb 22 at 11 at offices of Hodgson, Salisbury st, Strand
Walker, John, and Mary Barnes, Bury, Lancashire, Hat Manufacturers. Feb 24 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Co, Union st, Bury
Walker, Matthew Henry, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Clothier, Feb 22 at 12 at offices of Singleton, St James' row, Sheffield
Ward, William, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Innkeeper. Feb 27 at 11 at offices of Marshall, Essex place, Cheltenham
Watkinson, James, Tickhill, York, Cooper. Feb 24 at 1 at the Wellington Inn, Market place, Doncaster. Hoyle, Rotherham
Wilcox, Joseph, Manchester, Chain Manufacturer. Feb 24 at 3 at offices of Lynde, Princes st, Manchester
Wild, William Henry, Bolton, Lancashire, Drysalter. Feb 22 at 3 at offices of Ryley, Mawdsley st, Bolton
Williamson, John Austin, Regent st, Piccadilly, Coal Merchant. Feb 19 at 10 at 145, Cheapside. Holmes, Fenchurch st
Withers, Edward, Romsey, Hants, Cabinet Maker. Feb 20 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, King st, Cheapside. Killby, Southampton
Wilson, John, Cossall, Nottingham, Farmer. Feb 24 at 12 at offices of Bright, jun, Town Club chambers, Wheeler gate, Nottingham
Woolgar, William, Chapter st, Westminster, Dairyman. Feb 25 at 3 at offices of Jenkins, Tavistock st, Covent garden
Wyatt, George, Bristol, Dealer in Fancy Goods. Feb 23 at 2 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange, Bristol. Beckingham, Bristol